DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 040 UD 014 355

TITLE	Federal Food Programs--1973. Part 4--School Food Program Needs. Hearings Before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs of the United States Senate, Ninety-Third Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D. C. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.
PUB DATE	17 Sep 73
NOTE	161p.; Committee Print; p. 450-470, a copyrighted article from "School Lunch Journal," have been deleted from this document
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($1.45)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Breakfast Programs; City Problems; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Federal Aid; Food Standards; Government Role; Health Needs; Hunger; Lunch Programs; *Nutrition; Nutrition Instruction; Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Urban Population

ABSTRACT

These hearings before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs focused on ways to provide adequate nutrition to millions of children attending schools not participating in the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Programs. Testimony was heard from the following witnesses: Mr. Sam Winer, past president, U.S. Jaycees; Mr. Robert M. Benedict, national director, Center for Improved Child Nutrition, U.S. Jaycees; Mr. Lowell Kruse, past president, Minneapolis Jaycees; Mrs. William Baisinger, coordinator of legislative activity, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Ms. Isabelle Hallahan, president, American Dietetic Association; Ms. Amalea Nielson, co-chairman, Nutrition in Schools Program, Chicago Junior Association of Commerce and Industry; Mr. Robert K. Cherry, director, Archdiocese of Chicago School Lunch Program; Mr. Clayton Yeutter, assistant secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, accompanied by Mr. Edward J. Hekman, administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, and Mr. Herbert Rorex, director, Child Nutrition Service, Food and Nutrition Service; Mrs. Gretchen Kraus, chairman, Nutrition Education Committee, Woman's Auxiliary to the Massachusetts Medical Society; and Mr. Patrick Temple-West, director, Nutritional Development Services, Archdiocese of Philadelphia. (Author/JM)

ED 094040

FEDERAL FOOD PROGRAMS—1973

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS
OF THE
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

PART 4—SCHOOL FOOD PROGRAM NEEDS
WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 17, 1973

Series 73/FFP4

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
23-371 O WASHINGTON : 1973

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price $1.45

UD 014355

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota, *Chairman*

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ALAN CRANSTON, California
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio

KENNETH SCHLOSSBERG, *Staff Director*

FEDERAL FOOD PROGRAMS:

- Part 1—Vending Machine Competition With the National School Lunch Program, April 17, 1973.
- Part 2—Hunger in 1973, June 4, 1973.
- **Part 3—Supplementary Food Programs, August 28, 1973.**
- **Part 4—School Food Program Needs, September 17, 1973.**
- **Part 5—Domestic Emergency Food Assistance, October 12, 1973.**

CONTENTS

FEDERAL FOOD PROGRAMS
School Food Program Needs

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1973

Page
Announcement of hearing by Senator McGovern, chairman vi
Opening statement by Senator Humphrey, presiding 395

WITNESSES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

Winer, Mr. Sam, past president, U.S. Jaycees 396
Benedict, Mr. Robert M., national director, Center for Improved Child Nutrition, U.S. Jaycees 399
Kruse, Mr. Lowell, past president, Minneapolis Jaycees 412
Baisinger, Mrs. William, coordinator of legislative activity, National Congress of Parents and Teachers 415
Hallahan, Ms. Isabelle, president, American Dietetic Association 419
Nielson, Ms. Amalea, co-chairman, Nutrition in Schools Program, Chicago Junior Association of Commerce and Industry 422
Cherry, Mr. Robert K., director, Archdiocese of Chicago School Lunch Program 427
Yeutter, Mr. Clayton, assistant secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture; accompanied by,
Hekman, Mr. Edward J., administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, and Rorex, Mr. Herbert, director, Child Nutrition Service, Food and Nutrition Service 431
  Prepared statement 432
Kraus, Mrs. Gretchen, chairman, Nutrition Education Committee, Woman's Auxiliary to the Massachusetts Medical Society 442
Temple-West, Mr. Patrick F. E., director, Nutritional Development Services, Archdiocese of Philadelphia 445

APPENDIX

Item 1—Submitted by witnesses:
  From Robert M. Benedict:
    The American Legion—Resolution No. 441, Adequate Nutrition for Schoolchildren 451
  From Robert K. Cherry:
    Chart of increased costs to the Archdiocese of Chicago School Lunch Program 452
  From Gretchen Kraus:
    Focus on Nutrition—You Can't Teach a Hungry Child, by Mrs. Dorothy L. Callahan 453
    Focus on Nutrition; report on study of 80,000 Massachusetts Public School Children 469
    University of Massachusetts Agricultural Extension Service curriculum 471

Page

Item 2—From other than witnesses:

McGovern, the Honorable George, a U.S. Senator from the State of South Dakota; testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Sept. 13, 1973 493
Report of the Comptroller General to the Congress, June 29, 1973: Progress and Problems in Achieving Objectives of School Lunch Program 496

Item 3—Articles of interest:

Newspaper articles:

Proxmire Lashes Butz for School Milk Cuts; The Washington Post, Sept. 17, 1973 545
... But Some Hunger, Too; The New York Times, Sept. 17, 1973 545
S. 1063, 93d Cong., 1st Sess., Mar. 1, 1973 546
H.R. 9639, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. (Report No. 93-404) 560

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS
September 17, 1973.

HEARINGS TO BE HELD ON SCHOOL FOOD PROGRAM NEEDS

Senator George McGovern (D.-S. Dak.), chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, announced today that hearings will be held on ways to provide adequate nutrition to millions of children attending schools not participating in the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Programs.

The hearing, to be chaired by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D.-Minn.) is scheduled for Monday, September 17, at 10 a.m. in room 1318 of the Dirksen Office Building.

Upon calling the hearing, Senator McGovern noted that 5 million children, in 17,700 schools across this land, do not participate in the National School Lunch Program. Also that over a million of these children are from families below the poverty level.

Senator McGovern said: "These and all other children should have access to this program, which supplies a nutritious meal at a reasonable price. Congress intended school lunch legislation as a measure to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children. It is important we resolve immediately those problems which prevent participation by so many children.

"During this period of vastly increased food costs, many families are struggling for ways to feed their families nutritious meals. School lunches can provide one source of inexpensive nutritious food to schoolchildren, and it is our obligation to help the parents as well as the children by following the intent of the law and ensure that each child has access to a school lunch."

Lack of cooking and storage equipment is one of the prime causes of nonparticipation. USDA's own incomplete survey shows that schools need $83 million worth of equipment. A separate survey by Food Research Action Center in New York shows a slightly lesser amount. Yet, USDA has requested only $6.1 million for equipment for this fiscal year while they are authorized to request $40 million. Emphasis will be given to the lack of equipment, with special attention paid to the budget discrepancy between the known need and the amount requested.

Witnesses will be from a coalition of concerned groups organized by the Jaycee Center for Improved Child Nutrition in Bloomington, Minn. The coalition includes, among others, the American Legion, the American Medical Association Women's Auxiliary, the National Catholic Congress, and the National PTA.

The administration, represented by Agriculture Department Assistant Secretary Clayton Yeutter, will also testify.

V/(VD)

FEDERAL FOOD PROGRAMS

School Food Program Needs

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1973

U.S. Senate
Select Committee on
Nutrition and Human Needs
Washington, D.C.

The Select Committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 1318 of the Dirksen Office Building, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey presiding.

Present: Senators Humphrey and Hart.

Staff members present: Kenneth Schlossberg, staff director; Alan J. Stone, counsel; Marshall L. Matz, assistant counsel; and Vernon M. Goetcheus, chief, minority staff.

Senator Humphrey. The hearing will come to order.

Our chairman, Senator McGovern, has asked me to preside at this hearing—this I am happy to do. The first thing I want to say for this record is that I want to commend the committee and its staff for the excellent work they have been doing by bringing to the public's attention the problems of malnutrition with the prospects and the hopes that are to be found in adequate nutrition.

This has been an educational achievement that has had a very healthy impact on legislation and on the public attitude. Today's hearing unfolds further our continuing effort to feed American schoolchildren. Both Senator McGovern and myself have been in the forefront of this effort on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—the legislative committee on which we serve—to extend and improve our school feeding program. This includes the Breakfast Program, the School Lunch Program, the many special feeding programs that we have for children, including our Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants, and Children. Also, we have both participated in the efforts of feeding for the elderly.

We will include for this record the statement of our chairman, Senator George McGovern testifying before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on September 13, 1973.[1]

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUMPHREY, PRESIDING

Senator Humphrey. Officials at the local, State, and Federal levels have worked cooperatively with thousands of dedicated school lunch personnel to make this child nutrition program one of our great accomplishments.

---

[1] See Appendix, p. 493.

However, because our children deserve the best we have to offer, not one of us can rest on our past successes. We know there are numerous problems still to be solved if we are to meet our stated goal of feeding each of America's schoolchildren a nutritious meal. Recently I have joined with several of my colleagues in introducing legislation both to meet the financial crisis in the School Lunch Program—caused by inflationary food costs—and to restore cutbacks in the Special Milk Program. These measures are intended to keep the program at the level it has attained—an effort to hold the line in the face of tremendous fiscal difficulty.

I want to interject that I am not for just "holding the line." I don't think that line is advanced far enough. I still believe that every boy and girl is entitled to at least one nutritious lunch per day as they attend our schools under the laws of compulsory education. Exactly like every member of the armed services—who had to participate in the days of Selective Service—was entitled to, at least, one good meal a day.

Hopefully they had more than that. But there is a national policy, here, to which we have to direct our attention. One—at least one—good nutritious meal per day for every boy and girl that attends the American school system.

Todays' hearing, however, deals with another equally pressing problem in the School Lunch Program—how to reach those 5 million children in 17,700 schools across this country which are not now participating in the School Lunch Program.

I understand that the panel presenting testimony today represents groups working with nonparticipating schools in order to persuade them that they can make no greater investment than feeding their young students. I am looking forward to learning from their experience.

Members of Congress have long heard of the attitudinal problems of some communities toward participation in the School Lunch Program. We have, also, repeatedly heard that one, if not the main, problem confronting no-program schools is the lack of equipment to cook and store food. As a result, Congress ordered in Public Law 92-433 that the USDA make a survey of schools as to their equipment needs. That survey, with several key States not yet reporting, shows an equipment needs excess of $83 million. Similar private studies have shown comparable amounts. With an expenditure the last 2 years of $16.1 million per year, we have to assume this impediment to program participation has not been cleared.

The appropriation, or at least the authorization, was substantially larger. The authorization was for $40 million.

I hope Dr. Yeutter and other witnesses from the Department of Agriculture will explain to us, today, what plans the Department has taken as a result of this survey.

This past Friday, the Department of Agriculture issued a press release describing, among other things, how the milk program is growing and how the Department has dedicated itself to include those 5 million nonparticipating schoolchildren.

It appears curious to me that the Department of Agriculture makes statements like that. There is some evidence that less than every effort is being made.

For example:

1. A recently released GAO report on "Problems in Achieving the Objectives of the School Lunch Program" is critical of USDA regional offices and State food offices for making only limited efforts to extend the School Lunch Program.

Also USDA has asked for only $16.1 million in equipment money, while their own incomplete study shows a need for $83 million.

2. They fight our efforts to increase Section 4 money, even though their own studies show participation will drop when schools raise their prices.

We know they have from a study[1] done by this Select Committee. If existing programs are suffering such difficulties, what incentive is there for a new school to enter the program only to be faced with an immediate deficit?

3. The Department has cut back by two-thirds the Special Milk Program. In effect, this has meant no free milk for tens of thousands of low-income children, no milk as snacks in kindergartens, and no milk in those schools which may have offered it as a temporary substitute for the Breakfast Program. Again what school would want to begin its program under such circumstances?

I know members of our panel today have first-hand knowledge as to the extent those and other problems obstruct full participation in the School Lunch Program. Their contribution will be valuable.

I am, also, looking forward to Dr. Yeutter's explanation for this discrepancy between the Department's stated goals and their actions.

This morning I noticed that one of the Senators, Senator Proxmire, according to an article, in the Washington Post has accused Secretary Butz of breaking the law by cutting back on the program of providing low-cost milk to school children. In the past, Proxmire said yesterday, the program has provided milk for about 4 cents per half pint for children during consumption during a snack break.

Butz has limited the schools without a lunch program. I will have the entire statement of Senator Proxmire placed in the record[2] as it appeared in the Monday, September 17, 1973, Washington Post.

Also, in the New York Times of Monday, September 17, there is an editorial that relates to the Nation's schools. One feature of it that relates to hunger reads: "Close to a million youngsters have returned to school to find that no free- or low-cost lunches are now available to them."

We will have that editorial of the Times included in this record.[3]

I should note for cross reference that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has also held extensive hearings from the legislative point of view. As you know, Dr. Yeutter, you were with us the other day.

With that we will proceed with the first witness, Mr. Robert Benedict, from Bloomington, Minn. He is one of our community leaders, and is the national director for child nutrition of the U.S. Jaycees, we are very grateful to him.

---

[1] *See* School Food Program Needs, a working paper, September 1973, Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

[2] See Appendix, p. 345.

[3] See Appendix, p. 345.

While I have the chance, I want to compliment the Jaycees on their very excellent program of community interest in a host of fields. I am familiar with their work in the field of mental retardation, and the work of the Jaycees in my home State is nothing short of a singular triumph. Mr. Benedict, we are very pleased to have you here.

Mr. BENEDICT. Senator, with me on my left is Mr. Lowell C. Kruse, who is the past president of the Minneapolis Jaycees. On my right is Mr. Sam Winer, who will be leading off our testimony this morning. He is past president of the National Jaycees.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Winer, we welcome you.

STATEMENT OF SAM WINER, PAST PRESIDENT, U.S. JAYCEES

Mr. WINER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the United States Jaycees I appreciate your compliments to our organization. I share your feelings about the Minnesota and Minneapolis Jaycees, because they are the finest in the country as far as I am concerned.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify before this distinguished committee today. I know you are aware, Mr. Chairman, our organization is an organization of young men who are deeply concerned about the future of the young people of this country. We believe that the greatest contribution we can make is to have a positive effect on the hearts and minds of these young people, so that they can take their rightful place in the mainstream of America.

Our theme in the Jaycees is "People Progress" which is a commitment to mankind to improve the quality of life in this country. Our National Center for Improved Child Nutrition is a manifestation of that commitment as, since its inception, it has been responsible for the feeding of literally thousands of children.

We in the Jaycees are very proud of that effort. Last year, during my term as national president, I had the chance to travel over 700,000 miles and understand the concerns of many of our 320,000 Jaycees in over 7,000 communities around the country.

They are, indeed, concerned about Federal spending and high prices; but, they are also concerned with priorities and good investment.

Our members are 18 to 36 years of age, and for the most part have children in school. It is very easy to see the value of a 40- to 50-cent lunch to a young family man, or to two working parents struggling to make ends meet.

We know that what is provided is not just a meal, but a nutritionally balanced meal, and that makes a good deal of difference. When Mr. Benedict brought this proposal to the U.S. Jaycees last year to help involve the remaining 18,000 no-program schools, we supported it because of the proven importance that nutrition plays in the development of a child's education and health. Also, as Bob states in his testimony, if one of us loses, we all lose.

Far better to invest nutritionally in a child while he is young than to have to pay for him medically and on welfare when he is old. We know this is a critical period for the national School Lunch Program, for food prices have never been higher. However, we believe the best method to relieve the cost to school districts is not to pass the cost on to the middle-class consumer; but, rather, to raise reimbursement rates.

The poor child is already receiving a free lunch, so the cost will again be borne by the young family man who is struggling to establish himself and has not yet hit his peak earning years.

I have reviewed Bob's testimony, based on his many months as national director of this effort, and I feel his recommendations are excellent. I also know that the U.S. Jaycee Center for Child Nutrition has mobilized our State and local chapters throughout the country and they will be expressing the Jaycees' programs of child feeding programs to Congress, to State legislatures, and local school boards.

Finally, we believe strongly that, as the center's newsletter "Common Sense" states, it just makes common sense to feed children.

It is an honor for me to introduce, Mr. Chairman, one of the most dedicated young men I have had the pleasure to know, Mr. Bob Benedict.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Mr. Benedict, we will listen to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. BENEDICT, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, U.S. JAYCEES CENTER FOR IMPROVED CHILD NUTRITION

Mr. BENEDICT. Let me say how proud I am that you are chairing the committee. Being from your home State of Minnesota we are keenly aware that much of the legislations for child care has the name "Hubert Humphrey" emblazoned upon it.

Gentlemen, we came to you today to do two things: To review the success, findings, and recommendations of the U.S. Jaycees in the area of child nutrition, and to announce the formation of a middle American coalition of national organizations dedicated to the improved nutrition of America's children.

UNITED STATES JAYCEES

The United States Jaycees is not an organization that automatically supports every social cause. Quite the opposite. We research, debate, and go through an elaborate voting procedure before lending our name to anything. The Jaycees believe strongly in the term "fiscal responsibility" and look with great favor on the concept of "cost-accountability." But, gentlemen, we are greatly concerned about saving a little money in the short run, only to lose heavily in the long run. And that's why I am here today—to talk about a program that is both highly humane and one of the finest investment possibilities the Jaycees have researched in a long while—the National School Food Program.

After exhaustive research, the U.S. Jaycees have found that where the School Food program has been introduced, it has had an incredible impact on:

1. Decreasing the dropout rate, absenteeism and tardiness.
2. Increasing academic achievement.
3. Positively affecting discipline and behavioral problems.
4. Substantially reducing health care problems and health care costs.

In essence, it is producing a far healthier, far more educated citizenry that is better able to break the poverty cycle.

U.S. JAYCEES CENTER FOR IMPROVED CHILD NUTRITION

As the Rutgers Study and recent GAO Report (Progress and Problems in Achieving Objectives of School Lunch Program) indicate, local attitudes are a prime factor in involving the remaining "no program" schools.

As a result, the Jaycees have established a National Center for Improved Child Nutrition in Minneapolis, Minn., to organize "investment workshops" throughout the Nation to demonstrate the impact of the school food program to over 18,000 no-program schools with a population of over 5 million children.

The workshop philosophy is to bring together the local Jaycees chapter and the local school board chairman, or superintendent, to outline:

1. The value of the program to the child and community in investment terms.

   After stressing the aforementioned findings concerning the program's impact on education, health, and overall behavior, we review the following:

   a. Greater share of the Federal tax dollar returning home (greater purchasing power).
   b. Increased employment.
   c. Long-range investment for widening the tax base and reducing welfare costs.

2. The numerous methods available for establishing a food program.

   Here we cover the on-site cafeteria, hot bulk, twin-pack, frozen preplate, Cup-Can, central kitchen, catered, and so forth.

We believe that our business-oriented approach to conservative school boards, together with having local people talking to local people about a local problem, has been a main factor in our successes.

RESULTS

Keying on 10 States with a majority of the Nation's 18,000 no-program schools, the Jaycees have been successful in involving just over 100,000 students on the national school food program during the first 8 months of our center's operation.

Ranging geographically from Phoenix to Minneapolis, from Chicago to Saginaw and Muskegon, Jaycee involvement successes have gone beyond encouragement to school districts to implement a school feeding program. In Philadelphia the Jaycees are themselves administering the school breakfast program to 35,000 children, and in Chattanooga the Jaycees have organized the city's summer feeding program.

But perhaps the Minneapolis example can best typify the challenges we have faced. The GAO report indicated that the main problems are, principally, money and attitude. With 19 no-program schools remaining, Minneapolis was building a central kitchen facility—to be completed by late 1974 or early 1975. We recommended that an interim breakfast program be established to at least provide something for the students until the completion date.

Three obstacles were pointed out to us:

1. If Minneapolis instituted breakfast programs in the 19 schools they would no longer qualify as no-program schools, and thus wouldn't have priority for nonfood assistance (since at least 50 percent of all nonfood assistance must go to no-program schools).
2. There must be demonstrated community support.
3. Already experiencing a program deficit, labor and food cost was a major problem.

The Jaycees checked with Minnesota's State school lunch director regarding the status of an interim breakfast program and its effect upon the priority of a "no-program" school for nonfood assistance. Told the ruling must be made by the regional office of the Food and Nutrition Service in Chicago, we asked for an immediate ruling by Robert J. Nelson, director of child nutrition programs for the Midwest region of the FNS, and asked for it in writing.

Mr. Nelson replied in letter form that as long as Minneapolis' application for nonfood assistance had already been submitted, and none of the nonfood assistance money would be used for the breakfast program, Minneapolis would still have priority status for nonfood assistance.

We then organized a workshop to bring together the "demonstrated community support" and Minneapolis school officials. At that workshop many of the Minneapolis representatives of the organizations represented here today categorically voiced their support that the children of those 19 schools be granted an interim breakfast program. After the workshop, the coalition continued their efforts and within a month brought their proposal to the school board. But the final concern remained: supplemental funds.

We knew that the little publicized but highly valuable "especially needy" status is defined as each state school lunch director sees fit and we immediately pursued the possibility that some of Minneapolis' schools might be eligible. By the director's formula, a number of them were, and the Minneapolis School District suddenly found itself with an additional $175,000 per year.

Although there were some concerns about scheduling and supervision, the persistence of the coalition paid off and Minneapolis involved the 19 "no program" schools by use of breakfast in some and lunch produced from a temporary "mini-commissary" in others. I would like to include a letter from the Superintendent of the Minneapolis Public Schools into the record and our testimony:

DEAR MR. BENEDICT: On behalf of the Minneapolis Public Schools, I would like to thank the Jaycees Center for Improved Child Nutrition and the Minneapolis Jaycees for rallying public support to involve our remaining no-program schools.

Public support is a critical need in expanding any program and the Center's effort to bring the PTA, YMCA, AFL–CIO, American Legion and Jaycees together in solid support for our no-program schools was extremely important. We look forward to the continuing support of the Center as we involve neighborhood groups in implementation of new lunch programs.

Perhaps the most crucial contribution of the Center to the Minneapolis Public Schools was to inform us of our eligibility for the little publicized "especially needy" status. This has resulted in much needed additional revenue.

The Minneapolis Public Schools believe that children must be adequately fed before learning can take place.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. DAVIS, JR.,
Superintendent of Schools.

From this experience the Jaycees developed a packet called, "Ten Steps to Involvement" (now being used by Jaycees nationwide), which I would also like to include in the record at the conclusion of our testimony.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After 8 months of dealing with schools throughout the country, the Jaycees feel that 3 prime areas need consideration:

1. Nonfood assistance.
2. Especially needy status.
3. Reimbursement rate.

Nonfood assistance—Full funding up to the $40 million authorization and elimination of the 25 percent matching funds clause.

In schools where the investment will pay off most handsomely in the long run, because the school lunch or breakfast is the only square meal a child may get (and in many cases his only reason for staying in school), the allotment of nonfood assistance money is woefully inadequate and looms as the prime obstacle and bottleneck to feeding children in America's schools.

In a recent survey of State school food service directors, sponsored by the American School Food Service Association and conducted by the Food Research and Action Center, it was found that additional funding of $28,232,196 was required to cover the immediate nonfood assistance needs of 43 States responding.

The Jaycees Center spent hundreds of hours crosschecking this survey and not only found it to be correct, but by surveying each State school food service director, found a tragic and vicious circle at work.

THE VICIOUS CYCLE

Presently, the requests for nonfood assistance funds are based partially on the number of application requests that a State has on hand. The catch is that schools are discouraged from applying until the State has the money on hand. So, since the State has fewer requests it gets less money, thus discouraging more schools from applying—and so it goes in a downward spiral.

This is born out in the response to a Jaycees survey of State school lunch directors conducted in March of this year:

IDAHO

> We purposely have not requested applications from all eligible school districts because the need is great and we know that we don't have the money on hand to meet the demand.

GEORGIA

Superintendents are not encouraged to actually submit applications until funds are available. The applications are complex, require bids, and therefore we do not ask for applications beyond funding capability. . . . Schools desperately need equipment if we are to reach all young people.

OHIO

Since our funds this year were so limited and schools knew this, most of them did not make any request after knowing that our funds were exhausted January 1, 1973.

SOUTH CAROLINA

In the program schools, we could use at least $300,000 additional funding to take care of current applications which we have not been able to process due to limited funding.

MICHIGAN

We are certain, as we have been very selective about soliciting applications to this point, that many more applications could have been received.

KENTUCKY

Funds for fiscal year 1973 were not sufficient to do the job we were called on to do and most of the claims had to be funded partially. No doubt, if the amount of funds had been tripled, the requests could have been met in full.

MAINE

We had originally requested an additional $500,000 for this fiscal year. However, as our funds were so limited, many interested communities did not follow through on their plans to seek matching funds required at the time of their annual town meeting in March. . . . Several communities must provide buildings to house the food service facility. Assurance that funding will be forthcoming is necessary to provide the incentive to build these structures.

ALABAMA

Requirements for participation have been restrictive. Therefore, there is no possible way to determine the actual need for schools that could conceivably qualify for nonfood assistance.

IOWA

This year because of the fact that our allocation was less, that more schools applied, and that applications must be completely processed by June 30 and paid by December 31, we: (1) Established a cutoff date for applications of December 15; (2) Had to reduce the percentage of Federal assistance to an extremely low figure to accommodate a maximum number of applications. As a result, 25 schools either withdrew their applications or did not fill out an application form but decided to wait until next fiscal year. In addition to these 25 schools, many other schools indicated a need but did not consider filling out an application because they considered the percentage of Federal assistance to be too low and could not come up with enough money from their budgets to provide the school's share of the cost. . . . My plea under our circumstances is to urge the Congress to make the appropriation adequate for fiscal year 1974, since the authorization is now $40 million.

CONCLUSION

There seems to be a real corroboration between the recent GAO Report (Progress and Problems in Achieving Objectives of School Lunch Program—June 1973), the ASFSA nonfood assistance survey conducted by the Food Research and Action Center, and now the USDA itself, that substantially more nonfood assistance is needed for the continuing success and expansion of the national school food program. And the Jaycees believe that due to the vicious cycle at work in determining exact needs, the survey figures obtained are just the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

Also, if an area is already designated "needy" why should it be required to merit an "especially needy" designation to escape the 25-percent matching funds requirement? Asking a needy school to help finance this is like throwing a drowning man a rope that reaches only half way and concluding that we've done our part. It is our experience that many of these "needy" areas simply cannot afford the match, and the only people who suffer by this inability to match are the children and ultimately the Nation and American taxpayers.

The Jaycees believe that it is far less costly and far more humane to deal with a child nutritionally during his formative years, than to have to pay for him medically and on welfare in later years. We therefore recommend that the full $40 million authorization be appropriated and the 25-percent matching funds clause be eliminated.

ESPECIALLY NEEDY STATUS

The especially needy status was established under Section 11e of the National School Lunch Act, as amended by Public Law 92-153 in November 1971. Designed to provide up to 60 cents reimbursement for a free lunch and 30 percent reimbusement per meal for breakfast in areas that have a high percentage of poverty families—rather than the existing 40-cents and 20-cents reimbursement—many school districts throughout the Nation are either totally unaware of its existence or, due to bureaucratic obstacles, are unable to obtain it.

I know this is quite a bombshell—-for the correct understanding of this provision by our Nation's metropolitan areas will bring them literally millions of additional dollars for feeding our Nation's children. For many, this will provide the fiscal ability to overcome the present food price crisis and keep their programs operating. But lest the Jaycees be criticized for bombast or unsubstantiated accusations, we have done our homework and will now share our research.

DES MOINES, IOWA

Mr. Paul Underhill, business manager for the Des Moines school food program, was completely unaware of the availability of the especially needy status, and was sure that Des Moines had a number of schools with more than 75 percent receiving free and reduced price meals.

LANSING, MICHIGAN

According to Mr. James Kitson, food service director of the district, Lansing was nearly an exact duplication of the Des Moines situation, with both cities being State capitals; both containing a number of schools with 75 percent of its participants receiving free- or reduced-price meals, and both staffs unaware and uninformed of its existence.

GARY, INDIANA

In Gary, the assistant director for food services, Mrs. Steel, stated that she was totally unaware of the status and was sure no school was receiving anything but the 40 percent reimbursement. She was also certain that Gary contained a large number of schools that would qualify in the over 75 percent free- and reduced-price guidelines.

LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS

In a situation similar to Gary's, the bookkeeper for the Little Rock School Food Program stated categorically that no school was receiving anything above the 40 cents reimbursement for free lunch, and that she was definitely unaware of the "especially needy" status, as contained in Section 11e.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA

In a nearly identical phone conversation with Jan Gottschalk, assistant director of the Phoenix school food program, she was completely unaware of the status, certain that no school over the last year had received anything but the normal reimbursement, and convinced that a number of Phoenix schools should have been eligible.

The situation changes with the next examples.

PORTLAND, OREGON

In Portland, food service director Mrs. Smalley said she was somewhat aware of the status but for various reasons no Portland schools were designated as such. According to Mrs. Smalley, many Portland schools would easily qualify under the 75 percent designation.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Mr. Ken Baer, school lunch director, was definitely aware of the existence of the especially needy status but said that, due to confusion on the part of the State school lunch department and regional office, not a school district in the State of Washington was receiving especially needy funds. It is certain that schools in Seattle, Spokane and Tacoma would qualify.

DALLAS, TEXAS

School lunch director Julia Wells stated that she had tried to obtain the especially needy status since "well over 100 of our 181 schools would be elegible." She was, however, turned down, due to what she felt was the unwillingness of the State school lunch director to take on more paperwork. As far as she knew, not a school district in Texas was on the especially needy status.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Despite the fact that over 300 public and nonpublic schools have over 75 percent free- and reduced-price participation, the State school lunch director has decided that the high reimbursement rate from State funds automatically disqualifies any school, anywhere in the State of Illinois, from receiving Federal funds under the especially needy status.

BUFFALO, NEW YORK

Buffalo just obtained the especially needy status this year, after incredible red tape and reluctance on the part of the State school lunch office.

According to Mr. D. Edgar Gaspar, who is the lunch director of Buffalo schools:

> We were treated like beggars and had to jump through every hoop imaginable. In fact, it was just by coincidence that we even found out about the status. The next town over, Binghamton (N.Y.), had obtained it and a friend mentioned it to me. When I confronted the State school lunch office about it, they were reluctant to admit that Binghamton had the status for some of its schools, much less talk about eligibility for Buffalo schools. I don't know what's so secret about all this.

There is an urgent need to adequately publicize the availability of this status, as well as to obtain a clear, concise answer from each State school lunch director as to:

1. His guidelines for determining if an area is an especially needy.
2. The number of schools and children now being affected.

Again, the Jaycees believe the goal is not to save money in the short run, only to lose heavily in the long run. How many pennies we save is inconsequential to how many children we feed, and feed well. There is no greater long term investment than the feeding of American children. We therefore recommend that the USDA request and publish this information from each of the State directors.

In the meantime, the U.S. Jaycees Center for Improved Child Nutrition will correspond with all 50 governors, carboning each State school lunch director, and let them know of the Federal funds their States may have passed up since November of 1971, and how they should go about obtaining these dollars now.

Further action, I am sure, will be taken by the metro-Jaycees and the New Coalition. Mr. Kruse will discuss this later.

Reimbursement Rates—Escalator Clause

The reimbursement rate is all important in expanding the School Food Program. It is the pivotal point on which a program operates in the black or red, continues or dies, starts or remains active.

With the dramatic rise in food prices and the effect of phase IV, it is obvious that section 4 funds should be raised from the present level of 8 cents to 10 cents per meal on lunch and 5 cents to 8 cents per meal on breakfast.

Mr. Humphrey, that was written before we knew of your bill.

Senator Humphrey. Might I say that the Perkins bill, and then Senator McGovern has the emergency bill in, on which a number of us will join, and I have a long range, permanent bill, and all of them are at the 12-cent level, in light of the recent food price increases.

Mr. Benedict. May we also put our support behind that?

Senator Humphrey. Thank you.

Mr. Benedict. As a middle American organization concerned with fiscal responsibility, we ask the question: Where will the additional money come from?

In answering our own question, we'd like to present the following figures, which is a preliminary estimate by USDA of the amount of school food funds returned to the Treasury in fiscal year 1973:

SECTION 4—SCHOOL LUNCH

Allocated	$340 million
Spent	$320 million
Unused funds	$20 million

SECTION 11—SCHOOL LUNCH

Allocated	$587.5 million
Spent	$550.0 million
Unused funds	$37.5 million

BREAKFAST

Allocated	$52.5 million
Spent	$37.0 million
Unused funds	$15.5 million
Total unused funds	$73 million

Taking a conservative business approach, there is little to applaud in this $73 million not being invested in the nutritional destiny of our children. In fact, it is a great deal like the biblical parable of the talents, in which the man with one talent buried his and then expected praise that he had saved it. It was rather those who had invested wisely who received favor and honor.

But beyond this, the States too must begin to take on a share of the responsibility for this crucial program, as Mr. Clayton Yeutter has so often stated.

The California Jaycees are hard at work in Sacramento, trying to obtain a 5-cent State reimbursement on each breakfast and lunch, and it is our hope that soon the Jaycees and the New Coalition will be working hand-in-hand at State legislatures throughout the country.

It is vitally important that the reimbursement rate be raised, rather than the price rise passed on to the consumer. For when price goes up, participation goes down. Since the poor child receives a free lunch, it is the middle class child—whose parents have not reached their peak earning power—who is dropping out.

Our final recommendation on reimbursements is this: There is little point in continuing to have to battle for this raise in reimbursement rate every year or so. It is a crucial factor in the program and should have an escalator clause—tied to the wholesale food price index.

Senator HUMPHREY. This we have in our legislation, S. 1063.[1] We are going to fight hard in the emergency legislation to try to get that included.

Mr. BENEDICT. We believe this would save everyone time and effort, and would guarantee our children a continuing, quality program.

PART II—THE NEW COALITION

The second part of this testimony is especially crucial, since it involves the future of not only the Jaycees' effort but the efforts of national organizations that have worked for our children's nutritional destiny for decades. We know that the involvement of 100,000 children is a mere drop in the bucket when 5 million are still in "no-program" schools. But, we also know the potential impact of community organizations when they come jointly to a local school board. Also, we know the increased impact that organizations can have at the national level when they coordinate efforts on a particular issue.

Why a middle American coalition? For three reasons:

1. Poor nutrition transcends socioeconomic lines. The working mother is the secret of success in suburbia, and as the Massachusetts Study of 1969 points out, 257,000 children in that State alone come to school without breakfast. And with 12.7 million working mothers, nationally (with children 18 and under), many children can't come home to a well-balanced lunch. Also, providing a child with money in a no-program area does not assure he will receive a nutritionally balanced lunch.
2. With food prices crunching middle American budgets, a 40-cent or 50-cent lunch has tremendous value.
3. None of us gains, if one of us loses. If a child is not properly fed and is not able to take advantage of his education or his physical potential, the whole Nation loses his talent and then must later shoulder him as a burden.

---

[1] See Appendix, p. 546.

The problem is not improved nutrition for the rich or poor child, but improved nutrition for *all* of America's children.

FUTURE OF THE COALITION

During the coming months, the coalition will be considering action in the following areas:

1. Coordinating efforts at the national level to support legislation favorable to child nutrition by
   - a. increased nonfood assistance;
   - b. increased reimbursement rate; and,
   - c. cash in lieu of commodities.
2. Coordinating efforts at the State level to increase State funding for reimbursement.
3. Joining efforts at the local school board level, with local constituents of each national organization talking to local school board members about a local problem. This has proved to be an effective strategy and as the Rutgers Study and GAO Report point out, it is local resistance that must be overcome.
4. Nutrition education by
   - a. development of packet materials;
   - b. joint efforts at acceptance by local school boards and curriculum directors—same as effort with "no program" schools; and,
   - c. Implementation of nutrition workshops for teachers.
5. Vending machines—Working on a local level to limit confections that will endanger the nutritional health of America's school children, while perpetuating poor nutrition habits.
6. Constant coordination with the Food and Nutrition Service by
   - a. evaluation of "no-program" effort;
   - b. publicity of "especially needy" status; and,
   - c. dates for forms sent out.
7. Universal-Lunch Program—Believing that proper nutrition is the imperative prerequisite to improved education and health, we will research the cost and effectiveness of the Universal-Lunch Program, as well as the possibility of pilot projects to be conducted in each of the 5 USDA regions.

This concludes the testimony of the United States Jaycees.

FAILURE IN COMMUNICATION

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Benedict, speaking in behalf of this committee and other committees of the Congress interested in child nutrition and food programs, I want to thank you and your office for improved child nutrition sponsored by the U.S. Jaycees, and for your excellent statement. This is the kind of statement that should be forthcoming from our Government.

I must confess that there is material in here that I had not heard before, and I want to thank you very much. You mention that many schools do not know about the "especially needed status." That was the most interesting observation. You mentioned something about it being a bombshell. Did you come to that use of that word because, when you explored the program, you found so few that understood it or knew anything about it.

Mr. BENEDICT. Precisely, Senator. In fact, four or five areas that the Jaycees called at random were either unaware of the especially needy program status, or were unable to obtain it. That included Chicago and Dallas—and included the entire States of Illinois and Texas. I think we are talking about millions of additional dollars without passing any other Federal legislation.

In essence, this is the chance, I think, to save many programs that are now imperiled across the country.

Senator HUMPHREY. Who do you feel has the responsibility here now? The law was passed. Is that Section 11?

Mr. BENEDICT. It is included in Section 11e.

Senator HUMPHREY. Section 11e as passed by the 91st Congress.

Do you feel it is the duty of the Department of Agriculture to inform people about this, or that it is the duty of the State school lunch office? Whose responsibility is it? Since the law is passed and is supposedly operative, where does the responsibility rest?

Mr. BENEDICT. I would rather answer it this way. I am not so concerned about what hasn't been done in the past, but rather what we can do to rectify the situation in the future. I think we would recommend that USDA find out from the State school lunch directors categorically what their definitions are for especially needy, and secondly, to find out what the amount of participation is.

We know that individual areas are not aware of and have not been informed by the State school lunch directors. We know there is a failure to communicate between the State school lunch directors and the local area.

Senator HUMPHREY. Who appoints the State school lunch directors? I believe that is a State appointment, not a Department of Agriculture appointment.

Mr. BENEDICT. I believe that is correct, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. So our State school lunch directors, you found, were uninformed as to this.

Mr. BENEDICT. That is not so much the point. The State directors are aware of the especially needy status, but they have not been able, or have not, communicated the information to the local level.

Senator HUMPHREY. One of the thoughts I had as I listened to your testimony, and I can say this frankly, is the need for some seminars or training sessions to explain all of the intricacies of the law—the innumerable documents that have to be processed.

I notice the other day the new Director of the Internal Revenue Service took the 34-page Internal Revenue Service book of rules and regulations, as to how to fill out your income tax form, cut it down to four pages—he should get a Congressional Medal of Honor. That proves cutting redtape can be done.

In many of the Federal programs over the years, oftentimes they are not adequately implemented, either on time or in terms of quality. It is simply because those persons, who are required at the State and local level to be participants and to cooperate, don't have the full information as to how the program should operate. I am saying this *loud*, as I know the Department will examine his testimony. I would hope that all of these feeding programs the Department of Agriculture is involved in would hold information sessions—not just some bulletins sent out.

I don't know what other people do, but when I receive a document that looks like it is the same everyone receives, I don't open it. I have something else to do besides look at all that "trash mail," as we call it.

Now, everybody can't write a handwritten letter, and it can't be one that looks very personal. Thus I believe it is a necessity to have information or training programs when a new program comes into effect. It has new rules and regulations, it isn't good enough to just circulate the documents. You have to call people on in. That is the way the businessman does, when he promotes a new product.

I noticed, the other day, the Ford Motor Company is calling in the Ford dealers to talk about the 1974 Fords. They really are not that different from the 1973, but you don't sell 1974 Fords by pretending the dealers know everything about a model.

The Government seems to feel if they keep it a secret, they won't use the money.

Mr. BENEDICT. I hope what we have presented today about the especially needy status comes as a surprise to the Department of Agriculture. I have a suspicion that if Dr. Yeutter would put out the word that there should be information about this, the Jaycees could work very well with USDA to get the message out. If Dr. Yeutter would put out the word to the State school lunch directors, I am sure we could have a cooperative effort.

MOST PEOPLE UNINFORMED

Senator HUMPHREY. When I was your Vice President I put out a booklet entitled "Manual To Local Governments." I had 50 some meetings of mayors, legislators and county commissioners across the Nation, and I found out most of the people didn't have any idea at all what was available at the Federal level.

Once these agencies become established, then they say, "now find out." It is like a child's game—we give you a prize if you find out what we do. The fact is that they should be managing and organizing their program to do what the Congress intended instead of leaving the Congressmen and Senators to tell people about it. I have to be out every week telling people, "There is a program that meets your needs." Many of our welfare offices are unaware of some of the legislation available to help our needy people in this country. I think your effort here is highly commendable and I want to thank you very much, very much for it.

You commented in reference to this $16.1 million appropriation; and I believe I am correct that that is the appropriation, is it not? The authorization is $40 million—the appropriation is $16.1 million. That was the administration's request for this year and that was what was *appropriated*, not what was *authorized*. All I can say that we have all been derelict to let that happen, because that is far too small an appropriation by the administration to carry out the intent of the Congress.

I hope that you will see fit to have what we call supplemental appropriations, and the Jaycees could be very useful to indicate this to the proper committee—the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Senate, particularly the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. We are concerned about this.

The *authorization* was for $40 million. Even that is not enough. I helped get the $40 million. We had a big fight about that—you would think we were going to break the budget—$40 million. That isn't enough to supply fuel for a group of bombers for a weekend trip—but we had a heck of a time getting the authorization for $40 million for section 11.

We want you to come and notify the Congress of your concern. Tell Jaycee members in every State the most important thing they can do is to have their local Jaycee president and members to personally meet with their Member of Congress and their Senator—don't just depend on a letter.

Get to them. They come home. Call them, just like you call me, go right into their office and sit there.

You will be surprised how many people sit around a man's office that you don't really need to see. There are also people that come that have something really necessary for the country. They come in and give you a nice little, friendly greeting and leave a letter. But somebody who has a crazy, nutty idea that doesn't deal with anybody else but his sister-in-law will be in there for 2 weeks pounding you on the back.

I want you to get a little injection of that and really go after them. The School Lunch Program needs militant advocates—in the sense of people that will stay at it. You cut through a lot of this, and we need your effective help. I know what the Jaycees can do.

I know if you get every Jaycee contacting Members of Congress, you are going to change it here in Washington. Your organization can do this alone.

Mr. BENEDICT. There are organizations, too, that I think will work together cooperatively on this, and I hope increase that impact.

Senator HUMPHREY. We are grateful for your New Coalition. Now you have another witness, Mr. Kruse here.

STATEMENT OF LOWELL KRUSE, PAST PRESIDENT, MINNEAPOLIS JAYCEES

Mr. KRUSE. Senator Humphrey, my name is Lowell Kruse. I was president of the Minneapolis Jaycess from June 1, 1972, to May 31, 1973. By profession I am a hospital administrator, employed in Minneapolis, Minn. Our hospital has been aware of the role nutrition plays in health.

In February of 1972 I read Mr. Benedict's book, "The Possible Dream," concerning his experiences in Appalachia and the need to guarantee proper nutrition to every American child. I invited Bob to bring the situation of America's 18,000 no-program schools to the U.S. Jaycees, and they allowed him to address their executive committee at the national convention in Atlanta, Ga.

After accepting a resolution urging the administration to give this top priority, we worked with Bob to obtain funding and the Center for Improved Child Nutrition was formed in January 1973, to work with the USDA in their outreach effort.

My role here today is two-fold. To analyze how the center was successful in involving Minneapolis' 19 no-program schools, and to reemphasize the need to better publicize the crucial "especially needy status."

Perhaps the Minneapolis example can typify the challenges. Jaycees have faced nationwide in our effort to involve no-program schools. The GAO report indicated that the main problem is money and attitude. With 19 no-program schools remaining, Minneapolis was building a central kitchen facility to be completed by late 1974 or early 1975. The Jaycees recommended that an interim breakfast program be established to at least provide something for the students until the completion date.

Three obstacles were pointed out to us:

1. If Minneapolis instituted breakfast programs in the 19 schools they would no longer qualify as "no-program" schools and thus wouldn't have priority for nonfood assistance since at least 50 percent of all nonfood assistance must go to no-program schools.
2. There must be demonstrated community support.
3. Already experiencing a program deficit, labor and food costs was a major problem.

The Jaycees checked with Minnesota's State school lunch director regarding the status of an interim breakfast program and its effect upon the priority of no-program schools for nonfood assistance. We were told that the ruling must be made by the regional office of the Food and Nutrition Service in Chicago. We then asked for an immediate ruling by Mr. Robert J. Nelson, director of Child Nutrition Programs for the Midwest region of the FNS—and requested it in writing.

In a letter to the center, Mr. Nelson replied that as long as Minneapolis' application for nonfood assistance had already been submitted and none of the nonfood assistance money would be used for the breakfast program, Minneapolis would still have priority status for nonfood assistance.

The center than organized a workshop to bring together the demonstrated community support and Minneapolis school officials. At that workshop many of the Minneapolis representatives of the organizations represented here today categorically voiced their support that the children of those 19 schools be granted an interim breakfast program. After the workshop coalition continued their efforts and within a month brought their proposal to the school board. But the final concern remained—supplemental funds.

The little publicized but highly valuable "especially needy" status is defined as each State school lunch director sees fit. The center immediately pursued the possibility that some of the Minneapolis schools might be eligible. By the directors' formula they were, and the Minneapolis School District suddenly found itself with an additional $175,000 per year.

Although there were some concerns about scheduling and supervision, the persistence of the coalition paid off, and Minneapolis involved the 19 no-program schools by use of breakfast in some, and lunch produced from a temporary "minicommissary" in others. I would like to include a letter from the superintendent of the Minneapolis public schools into the record and our testimony:

DEAR MR. BENEDICT: On behalf of the Minneapolis Public Schools, I would like to thank the Jaycees Center for Improved Child Nutrition and the Minneapolis Jaycees for rallying public support to involve our remaining no-program schools.

Public support is a critical need in expanding any program and the center's effort to bring the PTA, YMCA, AFL–CIO, American Legion and Jaycees together in solid support for our no-program schools was extremely important. We look forward to the continuing support of the center as we involve neighborhood groups in implementation of new lunch programs.

Perhaps the most crucial contribution of the Center for the Minneapolis Public Schools was to inform us of our eligibility for the little publicizer especially needy status. This has resulted in much needed additional revenue.

The Minneapolis Public Schools believe that children must be adequately fed before learning can take place.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. DAVIS, JR.,
Superintendent of Schools.

ESPECIALLY NEEDY DESIGNATION

I would next like to address myself to the "especially needy" designation. From our experience in Minneapolis and areas throughout the Midwest, we have found that many metropolitan areas are not aware of their eligibility for this status.

With money playing a prime role in the Jaycee's ability to involve no-program schools, we feel any avenue to obtain necessary funding should be explored vigorously.

Mr. Benedict recommended that the USDA ascertain the following, a clear, concise answer from each state school director as to:

1. His guidelines for determining if an area is especially needy.
2. The number of schools and children now being affected.

The Jaycees have worked well with the USDA and feel we can greatly aid the agency in getting the message out.

There is a conference of metropolitan Jaycees of which I am a regional chairman. We will immediately encourage metropolitan chapters to contact their local and State school lunch directors to determine eligibility for this status.

I also know Bob will be asking the New Coalition to undertake a like plan. Between these assembled national groups we believe strongly that we can prove a valuable force in getting the message out, changing local attitudes, and encouraging the feeding of America's children.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to thank you very much, Mr. Kruse, for your testimony, and again commend you on your leadership in the Minneapolis Jaycees. We are very proud of your organization, and what it is doing now, and what it has done in many other efforts.

I took justifiable pride in being a member of that organization for better than 10 years, so it means a great deal to me.

I believe, Mr. Benedict, you have some more witnesses that you would like to present.

Mr. BENEDICT. Thank you, Senator. We do.

Senator HUMPHREY. If you will, stay there and call up the other ones you wish. We thank Mr. Kruse and Mr. Winer.

Mr. **Benedict**. The next witness is from the National PTA, Mrs. William Baisinger.

Senator **Humphrey**. Mrs. Baisinger, welcome. We are happy to see you.

Mrs. **Baisinger**. Good morning, Senator. I am sure you do not remember that I had the great pleasure and honor to introduce you at the Sousa PTA, in Washington, some years ago when you were Vice President. You kept us for 2 hours, but it was worth it.

Senator **Humphrey**. I must have had a lot of free time on my hands.

Mrs. **Baisinger**. No, I think you were a very good friend of the city of Washington.

Senator **Humphrey**. I was at your national convention at the city of Baltimore, I remember.

Mrs. **Baisinger**. You created quite a stir there, too.

Senator **Humphrey**. We are pleased to have the PTA this morning; and, particularly pleased to have you represent that fine organization.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM BAISINGER, COORDINATOR OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS

Mrs. **Baisinger**. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee:

The PTA's concern for good nutrition for children and families is as old as the organization.

Beginning with the founding convention in 1897 where dietetics was a topic under discussion to my appearance here today, PTA has been concerned and involved with the feeding of children, both at home and at school.

It was a logical step for PTA to go into the schools to feed hungry children. Legions of volunteers were mobilized to provide hot soup and cocoa during the 1920's and 1930's. And I am sure most of us sitting here recall, if not the hot soup, at least the cocoa.

At the same time, PTA was also working hard on Capitol Hill to persuade Congress to pass legislation "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children." Finally, in 1946, the National School Lunch Act came into being, and with it, the promise that our children would be well fed.

But something has definitely gone awry. The National School Lunch Act—like the National Juvenile Court—has failed to fulfill its promise. As of September 1973, there still are some 25,000 schools that do not participate in the School Lunch Program provided by Congress. Moreover, as a result of inflation and inadequate Federal subsidies, many of the participating schools have curtailed or discontinued their food programs because of a lack of funds.

There are 8.7 million students in the nonparticipating schools, and 1.5 million of them are needy children entitled, under the law, to free- or reduced-price lunches. An appalling statistic; and, an equally appalling denial of the civil and human rights of these children.

During 1971–72, 15 percent of 38,359 local PTA units reported the need to carry out projects in School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. For example, Alcott PTA, Kans., started a milk program when the organization of a School Lunch Program was found to be impossible.

In Allegany County, Md., the Westernport Elementary School PTA organized and prepared a simple free breakfast for all students when the school was advised it would not receive a Federal Breakfast Program. This PTA then went to its Congressman—and in March 1972 the school was notified that it would have a Federal breakfast Program.

In 1973, there is a very real threat that the national School Lunch Program may have to be abandoned.

Why is the national school lunch program in such serious trouble today? Is it because groups such as PTA have not been sufficiently vigilant to assure that adequate support was provided by Federal, State, and local governments? Have we allowed too many schools to remain outside the program and thereby implying that the need for the program was not as great as we believed? Have we failed to keep up with the changing tastes in food of our student population?

Yet the need for an adequate, equality hot-food program in the schools is even greater today as more and more women join the labor force—there to stay. Today, there are 20.2 million school-age children—6 to 17 years of age—who have working mothers; there are an additional 6 million children under 6 years of age with working mothers. And there are 11.5 million children who have no fathers or have fathers who are unemployed. It is no longer important that we question the reasons why a woman is working; what we must ask ourselves is where are the children of these working mothers getting their lunches.

Working Poor Hardest Hit

We know many bring a bag lunch to school because they are in nonparticipating schools; others bring a bag lunch because they cannot afford to buy a school lunch, and, at today's prices, may not even be able to afford a half pint of milk to supplement the bag lunch. Many children now participating in the School Lunch Program have been dropped from the program or have been forced to drop out because of rising food prices.

As a result of the drastic cut in the special milk fund, the program will be available only to schools that do not have food services for attending children. Consequently, with the rising costs of milk and the elimination of subsidies, schools have raised the price of a half pint of milk to 10 cents. The group hardest hit by the higher milk prices will be the working poor, and the families where the mother is the sole support. Their children already bring bag lunches because they cannot afford to buy the Type A lunch.

Moreover, as prices of lunches continue to soar, it may not be too long before most children will be priced right out of the School Lunch Program. How in the world can a middle-income family, with three or four children, afford 50 or 60 cents a day per child for lunch—plus gym suits, notebooks, paper, lab fees, shoes and clothing? They cannot. They are barely making ends meet now. Nor should we complacently assume that these children will get nutritionally balanced meals at home. On the contrary, with food prices at an all-time high, we fear the nutritional requirements of growing children are being neglected.

In preparation for this testimony, we took a quick, informal survey of the Washington Metropolitan area—a region quite representative of the Nation as a whole, with urban, suburban and rural schools within it.

We found that since the opening of school and the increase in the price of milk, there was less milk being purchased at school. More children brought thermoses, but unfortunately, these thermoses were filled not with milk, but with soft drinks. Many more children brought bag lunches. Schools were considering reducing the number of free and reduced price meals.

We also found that in the past year the commodities provided by the Department of Agriculture were inferior both in quality and quantity. Because the protein foods furnished by the USDA were so inadequate, schools had to finance the protein part of the Type A lunch. Should school districts continue to have to provide the protein foods—meat, chicken, peanut butter—we can expect even greater increases in the price of school lunches and the abandonment of free- and reduced-price meals.

There was great concern and even alarm about the use of competitive foods in secondary schools. Apart from the nutritional problems created by the use of competitive foods and vending machines, there is a danger that there may be exploitation of students. For example, in Prince Georges County, Maryland we learned that the student councils had been offered a share of the profits if the councils would operate the vending machines.

The National PTA has maintained that the sale of food items in competition with the food program authorized under the Child Nutrition Act and the National School Lunch Act should not be permitted in order to protect the position that each child participating in the school lunch program gets one meal a day that is high in nutritional value. As we have already indicated, for too many children this may be the only warm well-balanced meal of the day. The availability of sugar-rich and "snack" foods commonly sold in vending machines, or even lunch counters, would add to the dental problems of children among whom there already is a high incidence of poor dental health.

We were encouraged by the bill you have introduced. I think it covers this area quite well.

Senator Humphrey. Yes.

Mr. Baisinger. Why is PTA so concerned about the school lunch and breakfast programs?

"Hungry Children Can't Learn"

Experience shows us that well-nourished children attending school are more attentive, less restless, and have an increased attention span. A principal who for many years resisted a food program in his school in Prince Georges County, Maryland, now says that after his school started participating in the food program there are fewer tummy aches, less daydreaming and looking out the window.

The well-known observation that "hungry children can't learn" is still factually true for millions of American children. Not only is the physical health of these youngsters impaired, their low academic achievement will ultimately deny them equal opportunity for employment and higher education.

To salvage and protect the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs, we would recommend legislation and/or other action which would:

1. Increase substantially reimbursement rates for regular lunches and breakfasts. This is the heart of the problem. Inadequate Federal reimbursement for lunches and breakfasts threaten the survival of free and reduced price lunches. School programs can no longer help subsidize these meals.

2. Increase Federal subsidies for free and reduced price lunches and breakfasts.

3. Raise the level of income eligibility so as to qualify more families for free and reduced price lunches. That, too, we hope will become part of the legislation in the bill that you, Senator McGovern, and Senator Case have introduced.

4. Restore funding for the Special Milk Program to the level approved by the Senate for fiscal year 1974—$97.123 million—and put the Special Milk Program back in all schools.

5. Make permanent a policy of cash payments in lieu of commodities when the Department of Agriculture cannot deliver commodities of a quality and in a quantity to support the nutritional aspects of the School Food Programs. We would recommend that the ratio of cash reimbursements for this purpose be increased.

6. Adopt policies that would allow all schools to participate on an equal basis in the nonfoods assistance programs, and increase support for this part of the program.

7. Make schools with a high concentration of poverty families aware that they are entitled to additional reimbursement for lunch and breakfast programs.

8. Restore to the Department of Agriculture authority over the competitive food services, rather than leave it to State and local educational agencies to determine whether vending machine items and other items may be sold in competition with the Type A lunch under the National School Lunch Act. We would urge that only those items that are necessary to provide for the nutritional requirements of children and youth be allowed.

9. Establish nutrition education as an integral part of the curriculum, K–12. Nutrition should be part of a learning environment which teaches young people to make rational choices. We would recommend that materials and models be developed for classroom use, and that training for teachers, school food services personnel, and parents be provided. We believe the team approach to nutrition education is very much needed. Had we a team approach, perhaps the National School Lunch Program would not be in such peril today.

10. Increase the number of participating schools. For whatever reasons schools have had for staying outside the National School Lunch Program, it is distressing that children were and are the casualties, not only in terms of their physical well-being, but also their academic achievement and future opportunity. The National PTA believes every child should have the opportunity to participate in the National School Lunch Program.

INDIFFERENT ATTITUDE OF USDA

The cavalier and indifferent attitude of the Department of Agriculture has not made it easy for school districts to manage the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. The Department's refusal to spend all of the funds allocated for the programs and its unwillingness to seek additional support have created havoc and, indeed, threaten the very life of the programs.

PTA helped give birth to the National School Lunch Program because it recognized early the importance of good nutrition for the growth and development of children and youth. Our commitment to that purpose remains steadfast.

At the same time, we are aware of and appreciate fully the economic benefits that have accrued to our communities and our Nation as a result of these programs. If we allow the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs to be destroyed because of a misguided sense of economy on the part of Federal officials and some Congressional leaders, we truly will have perverted out values.

We thank you for this opportunity to appear before you to express the concerns of the PTA with respect to this important and vital program. We simply cannot believe that adequate support for the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs will bankrupt the Federal Government or contribute to the inflation in this country.

Thank you.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much. Mrs. Baisinger. Thank you for your statement and for your recommendations. Many of those recommendations run with the legislation that is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Thank you.

Mrs. BAISINGER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would stay here to listen to the rest of the testimony, but I have to leave the city today.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, very much for your testimony before us today.

Mr. BENEDICT. While our testimony to this point Senator has been fine, we have with us today representatives from Chicago and Philadelphia to testify about their specific situations. But before we call on them, I'd like to introduce out next witness, Mrs. Isabelle Hallahan, president, American Dietetic Association.

STATEMENT OF ISABELLE HALLAHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSOCIATION

Mrs. HALLAHAN. I am Isabelle Hallahan, a registered dietitian, and president of the American Dietetic Association. The association is comprised of 24,000 members who have as their objective the improvement of nutrition and the improvement of education in these and allied areas.

First of all, I want to express our appreciation for this opportunity to present recommendations on child nutrition programs.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

The National School Lunch Act of 1946, from which all subsequent legislation on this subject has emerged, had as its purpose, "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children."

Recent developments in the agricultural economy, with which we are all familiar, make it mandatory to make additional changes in the original legislation if we are to make continued progress in achieving the objective of the National School Lunch Act as amended.

First of all, the rising cost of food makes it extremely difficult for School Lunch Programs to serve meals that will meet one-third of the child's daily nutritional requirements as established by the Recommended Daily Allowances of the Food and Nutrition Board, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. If the entire burden of the increased costs of food is passed on to the children who now pay for their lunches, there will be a decrease in participation. Consequently, we believe that there will be an increase in the extent of Federal financial assistance in child nutrition programs is warranted.

In addition, School Lunch Programs that have traditionally depended on the USDA program of commodity distribution, now find that surplus foods are a thing of the past. Permanent authority is needed, therefore, to fund School Lunch Programs in cash to the extent that commodities are not available.

Legislation to increase the Federal share of financial assistance in child nutrition programs as well as financial assistance to compensate for short falls in commodities has already been approved by the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. This bill has passed the House.

The bill, H.R. 9639,[1] would increase the Federal contribution under the School Lunch Program from 8 cents to 10 cents per meal.

We also know legislation has been introduced to increase this to 12 cents, and we would support this.

Increases are provided, too, in Federal funds for free- and reduced-price lunches and breakfasts. The legislation also provides for cash payments to the extent that surplus commodities are below anticipated levels.

It is our recommendation, therefore, that Congress promptly enact legislation similar to H.R. 9639.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The American Dietetic Association recommends against the proposal of the Department of Agriculture to severely curtail the Special Milk Program. For the past several years this program has been funded at approximately $100 million per year. For 1974, however, the budget request is only $25 million. The administration would cancel this program except in schools that do not have food service. This means that children who bring lunches from home have to pay at least 4 cents more for a half pint of milk. Free milk for needy children is discontinued in all program schools.

---

[1] See Appendix, p. 530.

We recommend, therefore, that Congress approve the legislation that is needed to continue the Special Milk Program.

NUTRITION EDUCATION

Because we recognize the financial crisis now confronting School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, we endorse the enactment of H.R. 9639 or similar legislation. We realize that the emergency situation calls for prompt action. At the same time, however, we strongly recommend the continuation of Congressional attention to the development of a national nutrition policy.

We would prefer the enactment of more comprehensive legislation if the National School Lunch Act is to be amended. The most critical deficiency of the School Lunch Program is its failure to fully exploit the opportunities it presents for the conduct of nutrition education. We are hopeful, therefore, that the Senate and ultimately the Congress will approve the nutrition education provisions in S. 1063 that has been introduced by Senator Humphrey.

We urge the enactment of legislation to provide for the utilization of the School Food Service Program as a laboratory for the teaching of nutrition. Children should be taught to recognize the contribution that the meals served at school make to their nutritional well being. The meals and the pattern used in planning them could become the core for a series of dynamic applied nutrition lessons.

We also recommend a nutrition education curriculum taught under the guidance of a nutrition education supervisor to reflect the culture, ethnic and economic background of the children in the community.

These recommendations related to the development and teaching of nutrition education are consistent with and supportive of the recommendations made by the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition in both their 1972 and 1973 reports to the President and Congress.

On May 4, 1973, in a speech before the Board of Trustees of the Nutrition Foundation in New York, Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz said:

> Food fulfills the first law of life—it is the prime requisite for keeping a society alive, vigorous and productive. . . . Far too little is known about our nutritional needs, the extent of their effects on health, and how to assure adequate amounts of essential nutrients in the foods we eat. Also, far too few are the means for conveying authoritative and persuasive information to the public.

Nutrition education programs could do much to convey "authoritative and persuasive information" to children when they are beginning to form nutrition habits, thereby promoting their health throughout the life cycle.

Thank you again for this opportunity to express the views of the American Dietetic Association.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mrs. Hallahan.

We are very grateful for your presence. You have been a staunch and constructive and persevering supporter of all these nutrition programs. We are grateful to you for your help over the years.

Mrs. **Hallahan**. Thank you, Senator, it has been been our pleasure to be here.

Senator **Humphrey**. I want to incorporate in the record; prior testimony[1] of Mrs. Hallahan; the report[2] to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, the subject matter being Progress and Problems in Achieving the Objectives of the School Lunch Program relating to Food Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture. This report is dated June 29, 1973, and has been referred to from time to time in the testimony, and the staff of the Select Committee has inserted certain parts of the report[3] that are pertinent to today's discussion and hearing.

Mr. **Benedict**. Senator, our next two witnesses will localize problems to the Chicago area. First will be Amalea Nielson and then Mr. Robert Cherry.

Senator **Humphrey**. We are going to urge you to consolidate your testimony as much as possible. I want to hear the USDA today, and Mr. Yeutter has been very patient.

STATEMENT OF AMALEA NIELSON, CO-CHAIRMAN, NUTRITION IN SCHOOLS PROGRAM, CHICAGO JUNIOR ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Ms. **Nielson**. Thank you very much, Senator. My name is Amalea Nielson. I am employed as a marketing coordinator with the Marketing Company, a division of Eastmark.

School Food Program Crisis in Chicago

I have come here this morning to tell you about the crisis in School Food Programs in the Chicago public schools. This information has been developed by Bill Lewis and myself who serve as co-chairmen of the Nutrition in Schools effort of the Chicago Junior Association of Commerce and Industry.

Mr. Cane Jones, director of the Bureau of Lunchrooms of the Chicago schools was unable to attend these proceedings. We offer this testimony, also, on his behalf.

We are addressing ourselves specifically to the School Lunch Program in this testimony. Chicago also has a Breakfast Program, currently in its infancy, that we hope will expand alongside the School Lunch Program.

We will be speaking in terms of the fiscal year used by the Chicago public schools, January to December. This year differs from that of most schools that use a September to August year.

The Scope of the Problem

Chicago has 664 schools. Presently there are 535,000 students, 430,000 enrolled in elementary grades and 105,000 enrolled in high schools.

In the Chicago public school system 413 schools are equipped to serve hot lunches. These 413 provide 217,000 hot lunches per day for their own students and also serve 38,000 cold lunches per day to students attending 138 schools equipped with no food preparation facilities. In total 551 schools have a food prgram of one type or another. This leaves 113 schools with no lunch program at all and 251 schools with no food preparation facilities.

---

[1] *See* Part 1—Vending Machine Competition With the National School Lunch Program, pp. 27-29; hearing of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, April 17, 1973.

[2] See Appendix, p. 498.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-20.

Based on our 187-day school year, we serve approximately 47.7 million lunches, hot and cold together, per year. Of these 47.7 million lunches, 81 percent or 38.6 million are free, 19 percent or 9.1 million are paid for by the students at the rates of 32 cents for elementary lunches and 40 cents for high school lunches. A price increase of 8 cents at the elementary level and 10 cents at the high school level is awaiting approval by the Chicago School Board. When this increase is approved, it will be the first increase in cost to the student in over 5 years. We cannot raise these prices any higher without losing paid participation in the program.

The average cost per lunch in 1973 is estimated at 65 cents. This 65 cents is composed of 5 cents for milk, 19 cents for food and 40 cents for labor.

We are suffering very high labor costs in the City of Chicago.

In 1974 the projected cost for this same lunch is 80 cents: 9 cents for milk—an increase of 50 percent—26 cents for food—an increase of 31 percent—and 45 cents for labor, an increase of 12.5 percent.

We are currently subsidized at the rate of 8 cents in Federal funds for each lunch, 40 cents in Federal funds for each free lunch, and 15 cents in State funds for each free lunch.

In 1973 we estimate a loss of 6 cents on every free lunch and 27.4 cents on every paid lunch that we serve. In 1974 we project a loss of 8 cents on every free lunch and 29.4 cents on every paid lunch.

Senator Humphrey. What that means is what you have to make up out of the local school district. This is your local share?

Ms. Nielson. That is right.

This means a total loss, before commodity subsidies, estimated at $4.8 million in 1973 and $5.8 million in 1974.

Commodity support prior to 1973 averaged from 6 to 8 cents per meal. In 1973 and 1974 we estimate that at 2 cents a meal. Our estimated losses after commodity reimbursement for 1973 are $3.8 million. Our projected loss in 1974 after commodity reimbursement is $4.8 million.

Senator Humphrey. I would think your food costs would be less because you can buy in large amounts.

Ms. Nielson. They are less than they would be were we not able to buy them in these large quantities, but they still are very, very high, and I must admit at this time, too, we have extremely high labor costs.

All of our help has to be union and that does make a considerable difference. We can use no voluntary food service at all.

Senator Humphrey. Why not?

Ms. Nielson. Union restrictions.

Senator Humphrey. Have you ever taken this up with the Central Labor Council?

Ms. Nielson. We have.

Senator **Humphrey**. My point is—and I say this in a friendly spirit—in mass purchases we know you get a much better price. One of the problems I have run into at home is that the small towns can not buy in large quantities, as in Philadelphia or Chicago. Now, you come in and say your costs are higher in Chicago.

Ms. **Nielson**. The cost advantage is great. We buy on contract.

However, our contracts are subject to a termination with 30 days' notice. Just the past month, our contracts on hamburger meat and hot dogs have been canceled effective September 29. Our contracts on milk have been canceled and ice cream and fruit have been canceled subject to the date of September 29.

Get Tough on Cancelers

Senator **Humphrey**. I am going to give you a suggestion. This is a practical suggestion from a fellow who has been around a long time.

You tell those people who are planning on canceling your contract that you will keep that in mind, because they are not going to be short all the time. Just keep a little book, and they will take another look as to whether they want to cancel.

We have done a little of this at home. When a few of my contractors cancel out I say, "Go ahead and cancel the school contract, you will be around to see us later on—and we will see you fry in hell before we will give you another contract." They decided not to cancel.

These people have to look down the road 5 or 10 years from now. You are a big buyer. They got this habit from the oil companies, who decided they can willy-nilly cancel every contract. We are going to drag a lot of them up before these committees. We may cancel them, or at least scratch them up a little bit, when we are through.

This is ridiculous. There is no reason at all that a dairy should cancel your contract. If they continue to do so, we are going to call them in here and find out why. I am a friend of the dairy industry—they get a lot of help from the Federal Government—and should cooperate with schools.

The same goes with all these food companies. We are not that short of food. We have vegetables, and we have meat. We had this price problem for a while but that is no longer a problem. I mean, the price control.

I think you are too nice. You have to look at them and say that you are not going to take that nonsense.

Ms. **Nielson**. Senator Humphrey, I am not nice at all.

Senator **Humphrey**. I just thought I would put this on the record, because it would get around, and I will be watching these people. We have several committees here that can look into this. This is becoming a pattern. A number of suppliers are beginning to feel they have a seller's market, and they can tell everybody there will be no contract. They forget there will be a day when it will be a buyer's market—it is not far off in a lot of these commodities.

You tell them you have a friend up here. We are going to be very, very tough on them.

Ms. **Nielson**. Thank you.

As I am sure you are well aware, we have lost special milk subsidies in any and all schools with food service programs this year. This will cost our extra-milk drinkers an additional $464,000 in 1974. Mrs. Hallahan will discuss this problem in depth.

ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENTS NEEDED

What Chicago needs is an additional 10 cent reimbursement per lunch to break even on its Lunch Program in 1974. With the proposed 2-cent increase in the basic 8 cents per meal reimbursement, our loss for 1974 could be reduced to $3.8 million. With Senator Humphrey's proposed 4-cent increase, the loss is further reduced to $2.9 million. At the higher rate, this would mean a decrease from our estimated loss in 1973 of 25 percent.

We are in agreement with the Center for Improved Child Nutrition that the addition of an escalator clause to this proposed legislation is needed. By making reimbursement rates responsive to the wholesale price structure, the Federal Government can automatically respond to both increases and decreases in need. This escalator clause could eliminate the costly annual reevaluations such as the one taking place here today.

THE ESPECIALLY NEEDY CLAUSE

Illinois schools have not received any funds under the especially needy clause. Many of our Chicago schools would qualify for these funds. It has been the policy of the School Food Service Section of the Department of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois that the 15-cent reimbursement on each free lunch served in the Chicago public schools compensates for Federal "especially needy" funds.

This is not the case. We are assuming that 50 percent of all free lunches served in Chicago public schools are served in schools that could and should qualify for especially needs funds. We are also assuming that these especially needy funds would be granted on the basis of an additional 12-cent reimbursement for each free lunch served in a qualifying school. Especially needy funds in 1973 could have cut our estimated losses from $3.8 million to $1.5 million.

In 1974 they could cut our projected losses from $4.8 million to $2.5 million. This, along with an increase in the reimbursement rate of 4 cents, our projected loss for 1974 could be cut to $575,000, a decrease from our estimated 1973 loss of 85 percent.

We need help in convincing our State authorities that this funding should be used in Chicago. We know that the money is available—$73 million of the School Food Program subsidy appropriations for the last fiscal year, money that should have been spent, was returned to the Treasury by the USDA.

EXPANDING OUR NONFOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Chicago Public School System must be commended for the high priority it has placed on the School Lunch Program. A 62-percent availability of hot lunches in a school system of this size represents considerable effort.

Presently, we have 251 schools without a hot lunch program. Nonfood assistance funds are essential in providing these schools with hot-food service facilities. However, we have historically had a problem in obtaining these funds. In the first place, money is simply not available. Under current legislation, States are alloted these funds partly based upon the number of applications pending at the time of the grant. As Mr. Benedict has explained, schools are discouraged from applying until the State actually has the money. The fewer the applications, the smaller the grant, thus discouraging new requests.

In Chicago we face additional problems. We cannot apply for these funds until the bids for construction and equipment have been finalized. We cannot delay construction for any length of time. Cost increases too rapidly. By the time funds actually become available to us, building has begun or ofttimes has been completed. We understand that under current State policy, once actual construction has begun we are no longer entitled to nonfood assistance moneys.

Frankly, this is absurd. Once again we need help in convincing our State authorities that we are entitled to federally-appropriated funds. Once again, the money is available—$73 million in funds appropriated by Congress last year was returned to the Treasury by the USDA.

CONCLUSION

Let us review these problems once again.

The Chicago Public Schools expect to lose $3.8 million in reimbursements, a loss of $4.8 million in 1974, and realistically we cannot expect the school board or the community to support a program with a balance sheet such as this.

Chicago property owners feel that they are already taxed to the limits. The school budget cannot be expected to absorb this loss.

Senator HUMPHREY. Again for the interested parties, I want to emphasize that it is utterly ridiculous for the Congress of the United States to be holding hearings on the basis of whether or not there should be a penny or two-penny increase. It should be as automatic as any other escalator clause in a million and one contracts across this country. We had it in the Federal pay scale, there is supposed to be an escalator clause, although the President has decided he is not going to use it for a while. None the less, we do have a series of programs in which there are escalating clauses.

We put it into the Social Security Act, effective next year. Also, the Food Stamp Program has an escalator clause in it. We should have one in the School Lunch Program.

This is a matter of whether the cost of living has gone up. If the food costs have gone up, obviously, it has to be factored into the reimbursement.

I appreciate your emphasis because we are going to have a little trouble about that. If we had an escalator clause, in the minimum wage law, we would not have all the trouble we have today. We did not do anything from 1966 to 1973. Then after 8 years, when it was brought up we had to give such a big increase all at once that it frightened a lot of people.

This other way is a more systematic way.

Ms. **Nielson**. Certainly many of our teachers, administrators and taxpayers feel that this school program is a luxury and not a basic necessity.

We know differently. For many of Chicago's schoolchildren, the lunch at school is the only nutritionally balanced meal they receive each day. For some it is the only meal.

We need the reimbursement on every lunch increased by at least 2 cents. We would like to see it increased by 4 cents. For us to break even it would have to be increased at least 10 cents.

We need an escalator clause tied to this legislation to make this reimbursement more responsive to economic changes. We need to make food preparation facilities available to 251 schools. To do this we must receive nonfood assistance funds.

In the face of the overwhelming financial crisis that we face today, the Board of Education might well be pressured to eliminate the School Food Program in the near future. We know that if this happened, many of our children would not have the nutritional prerequisites to take full advantage of their educational opportunities.

We are all convinced that our children benefit from the School Food Program. We know that if we are to expect today's children to grow into tomorrow's responsible adults that this program must continue in Chicago.

We are excited about participating in this New Coalition. We hope that together we will be able to provide the necessary push to appropriate adequate funds for the continuance and the improvement of the School Food Program.

We, of the Chicago contingency further hope that pressure will be brought to bear on local, State and Federal authorities to fully utilize all resources available, both at this time and in the future.

Once again may I state the School Food Program is no place to cut Federal spending.

Senator **Humphrey**. Thank you. I think you have what it takes. I will vouch for you right now.

Mr. Cherry we will hear from you next; then we would like Mr. Yeutter and his associates from the USDA to take the witness stand.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT K. CHERRY, DIRECTOR, ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. **Cherry**. I am from the Archdiocese of Chicago which is the fourth largest school district in the country with over 250,000 students attending 408 elementary and 78 high schools. We operate a hot, prepackaged Type A lunch program in 121 elementary and 5 high schools, serving approximately 30,000 lunches per day. We have been operating this lunch program for 3 years. This year, because of the increase in food prices, our program is facing the possibility of having to discontinue service unless reimbursement rates are increased.

We presently charge the students who pay the full price for their meal 40 cents per day for the Type A meal. We are planning to raise this price to 45 cents by October 1, but because approximately 62 percent of the lunches served are free, this probably will not increase our income sufficiently to absorb the increase in food costs. At this time it is impossible to predict an actual cost per meal because our food suppliers will only quote prices at the time of purchase. Only two suppliers would give us firm pricing for the school year.

After working on the purchasing and supply problem all summer, we were fortunate in securing firm pricing for the year on frozen vegetables, and the containers used in our program. We have also been able to purchase most of the canned fruits needed for this year's program direct from the processors. This has held our cost increases on these items to a minimum.

For example, last year we purchased sliced peaches from a local distributor at $7.90 per case. The same distributor we purchased from last year quoted us a price of $9.57 per case on September 4, and on September 10, the price had increased to $11.20 per case. This represents a cost increase of $0.007 per portion in one week. However, this year we have made arrangements to purchase sliced peaches direct from a processor at $8.09 a case.

ALTHOUGH QUALITY LOWERED COSTS STILL INCREASE

To further compound the problems, the quality of food served has had to be lowered this year and still we face tremendous cost increases. For the past 3 years we have served all beef hotdogs, which we bought last year for 76 cents per pound. This year we have had to lower our standards and will serve all meat hotdogs at a present cost of $1.09 per pound. This represents an increased cost of $0.0413 per serving as well as a decrease in quality.

While we have served hamburgers with a minimum of soy protein added, we have never added soy protein to our casserole dishes in the past. Soy protein has not been used because our staff, and the children who have tasted test products, felt there was an undesirable flavor difference.

This year we are forced to use soy protein in our ground beef because of price increases. The cost of ground beef has increased by 32 cents per pound over last year and this increase includes soy protein added compared to pure ground beef used in the past.

As evidenced on the attached list the most significant increase in cost is in the entree items. Last year we served over 40 different entree items including roast beef, roast pork, corned beef, fabricated steaks, chop suey, and beef stew. These items will not be served this year unless prices drop significantly. When we face a meat cost of about $0.275 per portion for diced pork to make chop suey, we have no choice but to discontinue serving this item. The limiting of menu items because of price increases is definitely compromising our quality service; the effect this will have on participation remains to be seen.

As we cost out a menu, we have to remove more and more items in order to keep the costs within our income. We estimate the increased cost of entree items at $0.589 per meal. The second largest increase in cost is for milk, which is a required component for Type A meals. Our milk prices are firm only to December 31st, and our average increase is 1.25 cents per half pint, up 19 percent over last year.

Because of the increased price of portion packed salad dressings we have to discontinue use of these items. We will have to make our own salad dressings and serve the salads mixed with dressing. In the past we found that the children accepted and ate the salads much more readily when portion packaged salad dressings were used. If they did not like the dressings they would eat the salad plain. The use of these packaged dressings also added to the eye appeal of the salads and extended the freshness.

We have been told by all the dairies serving us to expect another price increase for the rest of the school year. One dairy has already requested a 3 mill increase per carton. Even if the price remains the same, from January 1 until the end of the year, the present price of milk alone will cost us an additional $50,000.

This year we were unable to obtain bids from the dairies with guaranteed prices for the whole school year. In the past this was not a problem. Our milk prices are firm only until December 31st. Only one dairy service would quote for a full school year and his price was $0.005 higher per school than our average.

As far as we know, from the information we have received from the State school lunch director, we are the only school system in Illinois without an escalator clause in force in our milk bids.

This school year we will serve over 4 million meals. If prices remain stable, the increase cost of meat items and milk will cost about $286,000, or $0.0714 per meal, more this year than last in spite of a reduction in quality and variety. Last year our average meal cost was $0.4901. Adding the increased cost of meat and milk alone to this average we arrive at new cost of $0.5615, not counting cost increases in other food items and labor.

Every possible means of cutting costs is being used or investigated. We are taking advantage of U.S. Department of Agriculture commodities as much as possible and are also using the State option contracts for supplies of bread, buns and mayonnaise. These contracts are quite helpful in holding down costs and we look forward to the future expansion of this program.

We estimate our labor costs this year will be at least 5 to 6 percent higher than last year. Thus far we have not been able to obtain the exact increase per meal as our school year has just started, and not all schools are serving lunches yet.

We can decrease our per meal labor cost somewhat by purchasing additional equipment to further automate production in our two central commissaries. However, this brings up the second problem area in the operation and expansion of our School Lunch Program, namely nonfood assistance. We are being delayed in this regard by the unavailability of nonfood assistance funds in Illinois. We are still waiting for our claim covering equipment purchased in December of 1972 amounting to $112,000. Thus far we have not even received the application forms for nonfood assistance for this fiscal year.

There are 46 no-program schools eagerly awaiting inclusion in the lunch program as soon as funds become available for equipment. Schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago are not required to serve lunches to their children. They join the lunch program on a voluntary basis. We must sell each school individually on the merit of serving lunches. Approval must be received by the pastor, principal, local school board, and a majority vote of the parents before we can introduce the lunch program into a particular school.

"REDTAPE" DELAYS SCHOOL LUNCH SERVICE

It takes months to get general agreement to begin lunch service. Naturally, once this approval is received the school wants to begin service immediately. In the past, approval of a letter of intent by the State school lunch director was sufficient to begin bidding and purchasing the necessary equipment for new schools joining the program.

This year we have been informed that the Department of Agriculture procedure requires approval of the nonfood assistance application before bidding can start. The ridiculous part of this situation is that these application forms are not available, and the State director's office does not know when they will be available. In the meantime, these 46 no-program schools cannot begin lunch service and are becoming rather impatient.

Our request this year amounts to $287,000 for additional equipment to expand production capabilities and start these new schools. This expansion would service over 21,500 new students at a cost of $13.35 per student.

Since last year two chapters of the Jaycees have been working with us to expand our program, particularly to the inner-city schools. We have 271 elementary schools with an enrollment of about 130,000 students without food service—many of whom qualify for free lunches. However, because we cannot get a definite commitment for nonfood assistance funds our expansion is almost at a standstill.

Estimates of delivery schedules on new equipment are quite long; convection ovens require up to 30 days delivery after release of the order—trucks are now scheduled for 12 months after receipt of order.

Before ending my testimony I would like to also speak as a member of the Advisory Committee on School Lunch Programs formed by the United States Catholic Conference. About 2 years ago the U.S. Catholic Conference began to form an advisory committee for the purpose of expanding the School Lunch Program to no-program schools in all dioceses in the country. This committee has met numerous times to plan means of expanding food service in catholic schools nationwide. Department of Agriculture representatives have attended all our meetings and have kept in contact with the U.S. Catholic Conference to help attain this goal.

With costs rising significantly on food and equipment and reimbursement rates rising at a slower pace—with reluctance—this advisory committee is very hesitant about continuing to meet our goal. It is very difficult to advise another school system to expand or initiate a lunch program when our own programs are in jeopardy. The few school systems that have attempted initiation or expansion of their programs have been discouraged by the small amount of nonfood assistance money available to them.

Many catholic school districts which I have talked to are very reluctant to join the lunch program because they feel it is not a permanent one. They follow the problems of increasing reimbursement rates to meet rising costs each year and see that only stop gap measures are taken yearly—thus the same problem develops again and again.

EXPERIENCE DICTATES TWO RECOMMENDATIONS

Finally, I would like to make two recommendations which, in our opinion, would help keep School Lunch Programs from the difficulties now being experienced; and would encourage other school systems to expand or initiate lunch service to their children:

1. Pass legislation which would contain an escalator clause reflecting the wholesale food price index so that we do not have to operate on a year-to-year basis, never knowing if we will be able to continue service the next year.

   We are not looking for a carte blanche proposal to use unlimited amounts of money, but simply a realistic reimbursement rate with which we can survive. A rate which would go up or down in direct proportion to food and labor costs. At the same time maintain the commodity program at the level of $0.07 per lunch.

2. Increase the level of nonfood assistance funding so the program can continue to grow and reach more of our children. An important consideration regarding nonfood assistance is release of the funds by the Department of Agriculture, and approval of nonfood assistance applications by the State at the very beginning of each fiscal year, so that we can properly plan and use this money to the best advantage.

I include as part of my testimony a prepared chart on increased costs for inclusion in this record.[1]

Senator HUMPHREY. I hope you will see that your messages get to the Members of Congress from your area, because the legislation is now pending. The House has acted, and the Senate will act very promptly. In fact I think it is tomorrow, or Wednesday, that we will mark up the legislation relating to the school lunches.

Mr. CHERRY. We will lend our support to that. The very difficult part is that we do not have general funds supplied by local tax money to support our program. If we do not get them we have to stop serving lunches.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Yeutter, if you and your assistants will now come forward.

Mr. YEUTTER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator HUMPHREY. You may want to respond to some of the comments you have heard this morning.

STATEMENT OF CLAYTON YEUTTER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, USDA; ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD J. HEKMAN, ADMINISTRATOR, FOOD NUTRITION SERVICE; AND HERBERT RCREX, DIRECTOR, CHILD NUTRITION DIVISION, FOOD NUTRITION SERVICE

Mr. YEUTTER. I was going to say that I am at a little bit of a loss as to how we should proceed, because we were under the assumption that the hearing was to be on schools with out a School Lunch Program, and we have heard testimony that relates to other than no-program schools. We are really covering material that we had at the hearing last Thursday.

---

[1] See Appendix, p. 452

I do not mind discussing the issues, but we would have prepared the testimony differently.

Senator Humphrey. Well, let's start with the no-program schools. That is where I would like to have you concentrate your attention. This especially needed category, I think, merits some attention along this line.

The rest of it we have pretty well covered in other committees and here before. So, go right ahead.

Mr. Yeutter. In the interests of your time situation, Senator Humphrey, I think it might be appropriate if we insert in the record the prepared testimony that I brought with me.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CLAYTON YEUTTER

Mr. Chairman and members of the Select Committee:

We welcome this opportunity to meet with you today to discuss our mutual concern to make school food service accessible to all children.

The Federal-State-local child nutrition programs encourage and assist food service activities in local schools through two principal programs:

1. The National School Lunch Program, administered jointly by FNS and State educational agencies provides food and cash assistance to over 86,000 participating schools, which serve lunches meeting Federal nutrition standards.
2. The School Breakfast Program provides food and cash aid to some 9,000 schools, serving nutritious breakfasts.

Child Nutrition Programs have without question, come a long way in the years since 1946 when Congress passed the original National School Lunch Act declaring it to be in the public interest to ". . . safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's schoolchildren." Thanks to continued public interest, congressional support and professional leadership, the program has grown steadily and soundly, until it is now available to 43 million, or 85 percent of the Nation's 51 million schoolchildren. Some 8.8 million children who are needy and can't afford the regular price of lunch are served free or at reduced price, more than double the number 4 years ago. In total close to 25 million children take part in the program and we are working with State and local cooperation to encourage still greater participation, especially in high schools.

Still, many schoolchildren remain outside the reach of federally-assisted child nutrition programs. Of these, USDA figures based on a 1972 survey of school food service indicate that:

1. Some 3 million are in schools offering a food service without any USDA assistance even though eligible for a national program.
2. Nearly 5 million are in schools that are eligible for USDA assistance, but offer no food service. Of this total 2.3 million youngsters are in parochial and other nonprofit private schools and the remainder are in public schools.

On the positive side, the figures show that of the 51 million youngsters enrolled in U.S. public and private schools, 90 percent have access to a food service program. In public schools alone, 94 percent of the 45 million enrolled have food service available. In many school districts—even in some States—all public schoolchildren have access to food service.

Included in the general breakdowns are a couple of special categories which we follow closely, but do not have a significant impact on the broad picture. There are about 135,000 children in schools serving breakfast only and another 315,000 in schools receiving USDA donated commodities only, and not the full benefit of the national program. These schools are presently required to serve meals free or at reduced price to needy children. Gradually these schools are moving into the Lunch Program and we encourage them to do so. Additionally, there are about 221,000 youngsters in schools which are ineligible for federally-assisted food service.

Our discussion of school food service accessibility focuses on numbers of children, rather than schools, because for one thing, children are the important target of our drive to expand school food service. Moreover, school—their numbers and locations—are undergoing constant change as consolidations and transfers take place, buildings are damaged or destroyed, new ones constructed. Additionally, overemphasis on numbers of schools can be misleading, because of widely varying enrollments. Of the 17,700 schools remaining without food service, 12 percent have 25 or less students, accounting for less than 1 percent of those in no food service schools. At the other end of the scale, some 13 percent of the schools have over 500 students each, making up 34 percent of all youngsters without programs.

Ironically, no food service schools—the group we're most concerned about—are the hardest to get solid information on. This is particularly true of nonprofit private schools, which are usually not registered with the State educational agency. If they aren't participating in a National Child Nutrition Program, or in some way known to the Department or State agency, they may not be counted properly. Conversely when there are school consolidations among the private group, and students from small no-program schools are transferred to a larger school with food service, we may not get immediate word to drop those students from the no-program column.

Despite these problems we have made substantial gains in collecting relevant data that offer a measure of progress in the ongoing drive to reach children in schools without food service. We place high priority on this activity, in keeping with the intent of Congress and the recommendations of the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition. Through the combined efforts of the Food and Nutrition Service, State and local governments, and concerned groups, the campaign has achieved notable results.

Since 1969, over 11,000 schools have joined the National School Lunch Program. The number of students without access to a school food service program has declined from 7.4 million in 1970, (the year of the first food service survey) to 5 million in the fall of 1972, when the latest survey was done.

Last year we stepped up the Federal-State-local campaign to reduce those numbers still further. FNS Regional offices and State agencies, with help from concerned organizations, kept up a sustained drive—through workshops, mass mailings and personal visits—to encourage more schools to join the program. Based on past experience we know that a large share of those who opted to join are starting programs now in the early weeks of the school year. We'll have specifics on progress when the results are in from this year's food service survey which begins soon.

Meanwhile there are hopeful indications of progress. Last year, for example, we held a workhsop with 100 private schools in Pennsylvania. We recently got word that 25 of those schools are starting lunch programs this year. Ohio has 20 schools in one district starting programs, as soon as their equipment arrives. California reports good response to their efforts to begin lunch programs in both public and private schools without food service.

One fact we have to live with is that we can't see immediate results of our efforts. Once we get schools interested, it still takes time to implement programs. With the complexities of constructing food service facilities and purchasing food service equipment it usually takes 6 months to a year in a single school and much longer for a large central kitchen. Further, there can be delays in construction and equipment schedules.

Overall the progress in expanding school food service to date has been encouraging, but we know there is still a big job to do. Of the 5 million students without access to food service last year many still can't get meals at school.

Why? We don't know all the reasons yet, but one thing we do know is it isn't always money or lack of technical know how. Less than a third of schools without programs are classed as needy. While aid to buy equipment can be a factor in encouraging needy schools to start lunch programs, we have come to believe that the biggest task is convincing nonneedy schools without food service to start programs.

Here are some of the reasons FNS representatives have found for schools not taking part in child nutrition programs:

1. Some nonneedy schools stay out because they do not have a commitment to spend local funds for equipment and furnishings.
2. In some instances, school boards, school administrators or teachers oppose the program, frequently because they fear it will unduly complicate their administrative and supervisory duties.

3. Many communities, particularly those of affluence and a low rate of need, cling to the concept of the neighborhood school where children go home for lunch.

4. Parochial and other nonprofit private schools pose special problems. They make up half the schools without food service, and are widely known to have financial problems in meeting their own priorities.

5. As I mentioned earlier, 12 percent of the non-program schools have 25 or less students. These are largely in rural areas, difficult to reach with food service. Operation of a normal in-school kitchen is often uneconomical in a small school and their rural location makes them remote from sources of delivered lunches.

The General Accounting Office found essentially these same reasons for not entering the lunch program, in their report on the "Progress and Problems in Achieving Objectives of the School Lunch Program."

Also, a study which Rutgers University recently conducted under contract to the Department, revealed that over 30 percent of nonparticipating schools surveyed would still not consider joining the program even if all the logistical problems in getting started were overcome.

This is by no means intended to suggest we ought to give up on this pursuit, but rather to illustrate the need to tailor our efforts to help overcome specific obstacles in different schools. The fact is that we are getting down to the most difficult schools to bring into the program. And we must plan and direct our efforts accordingly.

To achieve this, FNS plans among other things: Greater contact with State and local school officials, quarterly progress reports, along with cataloging no-program schools to learn more of the reasons why some schools do not take part in child nutrition programs.

We are greatly encouraged by the expanding efforts of voluntary organizations cooperating in the campaign. The Jaycees, for example, recently opened a National Center for Improved Child Nutrition to help mobilize and assist local chapters in the drive to expand school food service. As part of their activities, the Jaycees are inviting local schools to join in a series of workshops for their members. The U.S. Catholic Conference, has not only promoted school lunch in catholic schools, but has also helped locate no food service schools of other denominations. To further the campaign, the Conference recently asked every diocese in the country to appoint a school food service coordinator—and many have already done so—to work with problem schools. Other groups such as the Women's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association and the American Legion have passed resolutions of support and are getting actively involved in the campaign.

We appreciate and value the contributions of these and other dedicated organizations. They play an important role on the Federal-State-local team, seeking to make school lunches available to all schoolchildren. We are hopeful that our stepped up campaign will yield impressive results over the next several months.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed, now you can pick out the points that have been brought out in testimony that you may respond to the witnesses on the no-program schools.

Mr. YEUTTER. There has been, as I said, very little comment on nonprogram schools this morning. I wanted to say that Mr. Benedict and the Jaycees, and I mention this in my prepared testimony, have really done a fine job in attempting to bring nonprogram schools into the child nutrition area. They have been active in the program, and they have recently opened a National Center for Improved Child Nutrition, in Bloomington, your home area, Senator Humphrey, in order to expand their output in this regard, and later on today, I believe Mrs. Kraus is going to talk about her programs in the U.S. Catholic Conference, and our people are very complimentary about her performance.

Insofar as the Department is concerned, there has been considerable effort in this area, too, in recent years, and this is shown, it seems to me, Senator Humphrey, by the fact that we are getting down to fewer and fewer students who do not have programs made available to them.

In fact, my testimony indicates that out of the 51 million kids that are in U.S. schools, about 90 percent of them in total have access to food service programs, and of the public schools, that figure is up to about 94 percent.

So, depending on which category one evaluates, we are in the bottom 10 percent, or the final 10 percent in terms of bringing children into the schools and if we look only at the public side, which is easier for many reasons to reach than the private side, we are down to the final 6 percent.

So, there has been a lot of progress made, and one can go on beyond this, of course, and point out that there are some schools where for civil rights law reasons and others, where they are not eligible to participate.

There are some children in breakfast programs only, and others where they have commodity programs.

Then one can certainly evaluate the reasons for our not having yet reached some of those schools that are still outside the program. There are something like 5 million schoolchildren, approximately half public and half private, that are not included in these kinds of programs as yet, and at least some of those students are needy students and it would be very appropriate if they could be included.

There are many reasons that are involved here. I have enunciated some of these in the prepared statement.

One of them, of course, in at least some schools, is the matter of equipment and furnishings. That probably is not the major one. The major one is probably an attitudinal one, where some school boards just do not want a School Lunch Program.

This may or may not reflect a disinterest in the welfare of their students, but at any rate it seems to be an accurate portrayal of the situation in quite a few districts that are not now using the program.

STANDARDS MUST BE MAINTAINED

Senator HUMPHREY. This is a point that is disturbing to me. I recognize the validity of your point, but there may even be some schools where they may not want books—however, we see that they get them. We have standards, you know. I mean there are State, local, and Federal standards. Do you think that the whole subject of nutrition has to be not on the basis of whether you want it or not?

I mean if my children were growing up and you gave them a choice, they would have Koolaid. But their mother didn't give them that choice—they drank milk, whether they liked it or not, then they began to enjoy it. They had certain foods that they were supposed to have. I believe that we must get down to the point where what we talk about is in the national need. It is not as if nutritious food was hurting anyone. It is not as if it was detrimental to their physical, emotional, or psychological health. It is an imperative!

The cost of medical care in this country is fantastic—and we know that we relate nutrition to good health. The cost of school dropouts is a very serious example. Nourishing food is related to the rate of school dropouts.

The point to which I am arriving is: I think, in the Government, we have a special obligation not to merely say, "Well, it is here." I believe we must say not only that it is here; but, "you are going to use it."

Mr. YEUTTER. That would take legislation.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is exactly what I am pointing out. That is why I believe in a Universal Feeding Program.

Today we do not say: "There are schools here, and if you want to go to school, go to school." We do not say that to even the parents or the teachers. We say not only that there are schools here; but, "you are going to school"—because it is a national policy and program.

I believe we must have a Universal Feeding Program. The 5 million children not in the School Lunch Program is much too much. It is that group where you can have a tremendous amount of troubles—physical and emotional.

Mr. YEUTTER. To be fair to those school boards and school administrators who are not here to defend themselves, I believe we both recognize that there are ethnic differences from community to community. There are traditions in some communities where the children go home for lunch, just as there are traditions in some communities where you carry your lunch to school. So, in those cases there may be very valid reasons.

Senator HUMPHREY. I agree, that has to be taken into consideration. Nonetheless, I still believe in the Universal Feeding Program.

Mr. YEUTTER. Well, there are a number of reasons that are involved for schools choosing not to participate in these programs. I think the important point here, Senator Humphrey, is simply that when we have that final 6 percent or 10 percent to go, we are in the category where it is tougher. It is always easier in any program to get the first 50 or 75 percent than it is that final 50 or 25 percent. We are now down to the final 10 percent or less, and it is a much harder task to get those schools involved.

With respect to the other issues that were raised, this morning, Senator Humphrey, you and I discussed most of these in detail in our colloquy at the other hearing last week. I think there are a couple of interesting things that developed this morning.

One was the indication in earlier testimony that local school districts do not seem to either know about some of the funds that are available under the Child Nutrition Program, or if they do know about it, for one reason or another they are simply not applying for those funds.

STATE SCHOOL LUNCH DIRECTORS INFORMED

Perhaps either Mr. Hekman or Mr. Rorex would have additional comments on this, but I did want to make a point. There is no question that the State school lunch directors know. Our people have seminars with them. Mr. Heckman told me they had one with all those directors as recently as May. I believe they are working on another one now.

So, there is full knowledge at the State level. Whether that knowledge and information is being transmitted to the local level, I think we had best find out in view of the comments made this morning.

Senator HUMPHREY. Before you refer to that.

How did you respond to the USDA survey that shows $83 million in equipment needs while the administration is recommending $16 million.

Mr. YEUTTER. A couple of comments on that, Senator Humphrey.

The first one is that that is preliminary, as you know, and we need to finalize that report before we draw any final conclusions.

But aside from that, obviously $83 million exceeds the amount of money in the appropriation. But there are two factors that it seems to me we need to understand there. One is that the law provides that this program be made available to "areas in which poor economic conditions exist."

Much of that $83 or $85 million relates to areas that are not in that poor economic conditions category.

Now, if it be the will of the Congress that the equipment be provided to a broader category of schools and areas, that is another question, but in terms of the needs of the poor economic areas, that $83 or $84 million would not be a representative figure, because much of that request for funding relates to areas that are not in that category.

Senator HUMPHREY. How much have you completed in your survey?

Mr. YEUTTER. I believe it is almost ready to be submitted to the Congress. I will ask Mr. Rorex to comment specifically.

Mr. ROREX. We are progressing, and we expect to submit the final report near the end of October. We have all the work in the machines now for the compilation of the data and this sort of thing, but we will have a few blanks in that report because of our inability to get responses from the local school districts in some situations.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator Hart, I want to thank you very much for tearing yourself away from other duties. These patient witnesses must excuse me, I have been informed that I must go to the Senate floor.

I am going to ask that, following Mr. Yeutter and the Department witnesses, other witnesses who are here to testify—and staff will be of help to Senator Hart—to please keep their testimony within reasonable limits.

I understand, Senator, you have to leave here in about a half hour. Is that not correct?

Senator HART. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. I will double-check, and if I can get back here, I will. We are all generalists in the Senate, you know. No eye, ear, and nose specialists. We have to move from one thing to another.

I want to thank all of you who have come here this morning, particularly those who have come from a distance, and I also thank the Department.

SENATOR HART, PRESIDING

Senator HART. Was there anything on behalf of the Department that you wanted to add?

Mr. YEUTTER. There are a number of issues that were raised this morning, Senator Hart.

Incidentally, it is a pleasure to have you on the other side of the table with me.

This is Mr. Hekman of the Food Nutrition Service, and Mr. Rorex, Head of the Child Nutrition Program.

Senator Hart. We have met.

Schools Allegedly Dropping Out

Mr. Yeutter. One of the issues that arose this morning it seems to me is rather critical and it concerned me somewhat. It was the question of schools allegedly dropping out of the School Lunch Program because of the increase in the food costs.

Now, we will be involved in an annual survey very soon that should be available in October to indicate just what participation looks like early this school year.

But at the moment at least, we do not see much evidence of the fact that schools are dropping the School Lunch Program because of the increase in food costs.

It has been a problem for them, admittedly, as has been indicated by the testimony this morning, because someone has to bear the additional financial burden that is involved this year but I am not at all sure that we can legitimately draw a conclusion yet that schools are actually dropping out of the program.

At least we would want to see some evidence before agreeing that that is an accurate fact.

I started to comment, Senator Hart, as you came in, about one issue raised this morning, and that is local school districts apparently not understanding that some of the Federal funding is available to them, and this was actually with reference to the especially needy category. That is somewhat of a surprise, particularly with respect to larger metropolitan areas, because in most large metropolitan areas, they generally have someone on their staff who tries diligently to keep track of every Federal program available.

But at any rate, since the contention was made this morning that the school districts, local school districts, are not aware of the availability of some of these programs, we will certainly want to follow up with the State school lunch directors and find out why that word is not getting down the line.

It is getting as far as the State level. And if it is not being transmitted from the State level to the local level, we have to find out why.

Mr. Rorex. do you have any further comments?

Mr. Rorex. I am at a loss to understand that also, Senator.

Senator Hart. You mean the lack of knowledge?

Mr. Rorex. Yes, at the local level and the provisions in the legislation for reimbursement and in the especially needy situations where the costs exceed the mandated amounts.

When that legislation passed, we had a considerable amount of publicity concerning the publication of the regulations, meeting with the State directors, explaining the mechanics of that operation, and I have met, I know with 57 directors of the large city systems and this subject has been discussed at several points.

I think it is a matter of assembling the cost data in many instances on which a firm decision can be based. That would be my off-the-top of my head conclusion that on this particular point, because last year was the first time we had this mandated legislation about the especially needy over and beyond the 40 cents. We had the 30-cent limitation previously.

Senator HART. On the issue of whether the schools, as a result of policy, have dropped feeding programs I will provide you with reliable information from Michigan which identifies some schools.

I will send it to you in writing, not necessarily for the record.

MANY OPTIONS AVAILABLE?

Mr. YEUTTER. Fine. It seems to me that we will know fairly soon nationwide how much of a problem that is. Obviously that is a serious concern to all of us, if it is happening on any large scale. If it is, I become somewhat disturbed about the leadership that is available in some of those local school districts, because it seems to me that there are a lot of options available to those school districts in financing a School Lunch and School Breakfast Program.

One option is the Federal Government, and that is why there are bills before the Congress right now to increase the Federal contribution of this Government.

But that is not the only particular option. As I have indicated in some speeches and statements to the press here, and, in appearing before the Senate Agriculture Committee last week, there are certainly options for additional State financing and local funding.

The rearrangement of the priorities within the budget of the local school districts and to at least some degree for additional contributions by the children themselves.

It seems to me that until a local school board or a local school administrator has explored all those options and has received the negative response on all of them, he certainly is remiss in dropping a School Lunch Program.

Now, as I said the other day, Senator Hart, I recognize that not all State legislatures are in session and it is not that easy to increase the State's share and if levies have been established at the local level, it is not easy to change those.

I understand all that but we have about five sources of funding and a school district ought to be able to meet additional demands that are developing because of higher food prices.

I am wondering whether the school administrators are not using high food prices as an excuse to drop a program that they would rather not have.

Senator HART. I am sure that would not be true in Michigan.

Were there any other loose ends?

Mr. YEUTTER. I have nothing in particular. Perhaps the staff would have some additional things. If they do, I would be happy to respond.

Mr. STONE. I have a few brief questions.

The present Department regulation on especially needy schools, 60 cents plus a base of 8 cents, or is it 60 cents, a ceiling of 60 cents, and has that been changed recently, that status?

Mr. YEUTTER. I believe it is a 60-cent maximum. The utilization now would be a minimum of 40 cents plus 8, plus 7 with commodities or 55, but with the prerogative of going on up to 60 in needy cases.

Is that correct?

Mr. ROREX. That is correct. But the value of the commodities is on top of the 60 cents. That is cash reimbursement.

Mr. STONE. Has this changed in the last few years?

Mr. ROREX. That was in effect last year and the year before, 60 cents as the maximum.

Mr. YEUTTER. So, it would be 60, not counting the commodities, at 7 cents. This 7 cents was the last year guarantee, because what was not provided in commodities was provided in cash.

EQUIPMENT NEEDS TOTAL $83 MILLION

Mr. STONE. Could it be surveyed that the preliminary report shows $83 million needed in equipment. Is there any chance that that amount would be less than $83 million?

Mr. ROREX. Not based on that survey. My assumption is that it will be more in the finality. The first survey did not increase or include the number of reports on several school districts and several States; that is at that time.

Mr. STONE. I think we are in agreement that the amount will be substantial, perhaps more than the $83 million and I think we are in agreement that equipment—lack of equipment is a definite impediment to schools entering the program, and I know you are concerned with instituting programs in those schools that do not have them, and I wonder how you reconcile the budget request of $16 million with your survey.

I understand the survey is—that you are going to reassess the budget in this respect.

Mr. YEUTTER. I wish to comment on that, Mr. Stone. It seems to me we have to get the facts straight on this issue and we have to make sure that we are not talking about apples and oranges, because we are talking about both needy schools and nonneedy schools and equipment in one category and the other category.

As a matter of fact, in that first $83 million of the 12,406 schools involved in that preliminary report, there were 11,843 of them with existing food service facilities. There were only 563 out of that more than 12,000 that related to schools without food service, which is really the principal subject of concern here.

In the total of that 12,000 plus schools and $83 million, there is only the ability to reach about 156,000 additional children.

Now, 156,000 is commendable but in percentage terms, what we are talking about here—and we have to keep this in mind in evaluating this $83 million figure—is the request of schools that already have School Lunch Programs for more equipment, or for the replacement of their existing equipment.

There is very little in that total sum of money that relates to no-program schools. In dollars, the total funding needs reported for the no-program schools in that list were about $11 million. In other words, of that $83 million, the amount of no-program schools was about $11 million.

Mr. STONE. I think we are going to have to submit written questions to the Department in an effort to speed things up and bring on other witnesses. I had one comment with regard to your testimony. We know from previous hearings before our committee that equipment wears out generally in 5 years, so we, when we are talking about equipment for those schools that have food services, we are not talking about replacing equipment that is still working; but about equipment that generally has worn out in 5 years. So they maintain a need for equipment, money, and I think while you are pointing out the differences, I think we also need to keep it very clear that we have an ongoing need in those schools with programs, because we do not like to vary those programs with second rate equipment.

Mr. **Yeutter.** I find no disagreement with that except it has been the will of Congress that we give first priority to the no-program schools. The legislation provides that at least 50 percent of the equipment funds must go to no-program schools.

If Congress changes the rule of the game in this regard, that is another matter but within the present rules, we need to keep all those facts in proper perspective.

Mr. **Stone.** Senator Hart appreciates your testimony, and the committee does, and we are sorry to rush you but we will get questions[1] to you.

Mr. **Yeutter.** Fine.

Mr. **Stone.** Mr. Benedict.

Mr. **Benedict.** Thank you.

In the words of Senator Humphrey, I guess I am as pleased as punch that the USDA is interested in making sure that the extra dollars for the especially needy funds are distributed at the first opportunity to the local areas.

GREAT AMOUNT OF CONFUSION

It was stated that they were not really sure why this information was not getting out from the State school lunch directors to the local areas. What was expressed in our testimony was not only a complete unawareness in some local areas that this was available, but also the fact that there was confusion many times between the regional level and the State level as to what the percentage would be for especially needy areas.

In other words, the general category has been 75 percent free lunch and reduced price lunch. In some regions they are setting the 90 percent figure. The resulting confusion has been such that, in the State of Washington, there are no schools designated as especially needy. So, it is both an unawareness on the part of the local levels and also a confusion between regional and State school lunch directors and one I am sure Dr. Yeutter could go a long ways toward clearing up in a hurry.

The Jaycees and the New Coalition will be working at the local level and also through the State Governors to make it certain that this is cleared up as soon as possible.

I would like to submit a copy of a statement by the American Legion.[2]

---

[1] All questions have been held in abeyance until publication of the USDA Study of Equipment Needs.

[2] See Appendix, p. 451.

Now, I would like to introduce Mrs. Gretchen Kraus, of the AMA Auxiliary.

Mr. STONE. Is Mr. Temple-West here? Please come up, also.

Senator HART. Good morning, Mrs. Kraus.

STATEMENT OF GRETCHEN KRAUS, CHAIRMAN, NUTRITION EDUCATION COMMITTEE, WOMAN'S AUXILIARY TO THE MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SOCIETY

Mrs. KRAUS. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

My name is Gretchen Kraus. I am chairman of the Committee on Nutrition Education for the Woman's Auxiliary to the Massachusetts Medical Society and the Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association.

The Woman's Auxiliary is a society of physicians' wives whose purpose is to assist physicians as community catalysts in programs to improve the quality of life through health education and services. The Nutrition Education Committee is working with all age groups and economic levels. We are a nonprofit volunteer organization. I am speaking here today for the Woman's Auxiliary to the Massachusetts Medical Society.

I wish to thank this committee for the many contributions that have strengthened child nutrition programs. The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has helped to create and maintain a national awareness of nutrition problems.

Since 1946, the United States Congress has passed a series of legislative acts concerned with child nutrition. Their major purpose is to provide nutritionally balanced meals and to encourage the formation of good food habits.

The original National School Lunch Act of June 1946 clearly specified that "Lunches served by schools participating in the School Lunch Program shall meet minimal nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of tested nutrition research," in recognition of the demonstrated relationship between food and good nutrition and the capacity of children to develop and learn.[1]

The benefits derived from child nutrition programs have been generally recognized by professional workers, school staffs and parents. Teachers report that pupils are more alert and interested in their studies and have a greater attention span and improved school records after child nutrition programs are introduced. "You cannot teach a hungry child."

Objective data on nutritional gains are difficult to obtain. A survey[2] of lunch habits of 80,000 Massachusetts public school children revealed that almost three-fourths of the children buying Type A meals in school ate an adequate lunch, while nearly two-thirds of the children not eating the Type A lunch had an unsatisfactory meal.

---

[1] Child Nutrition Act, Sec. 2, Declaration of Purpose P.L. 89-642 (89th Cong., S3467) Oct. 11, 1966.

[2] Callahan, D. L., "Focus on Nutrition—You Can't Teach a Hungry Child," pp. 25–40 (March) and pt. II, pp. 26–42 (September) School Food Service Journal, 1971.

There is much criticism concerning costs of school food service programs. Alan D. Berg, former co-chairman of the U.S. Government Interagency Committee on Combating Malnutrition, questions "the economics of malnutrition." What does it mean to national development? How much more productive will a properly nourished man be?

He estimates that the medical costs alone necessary to treat the effects of malnutrition (either through hospitals or health centers) are many times greater than the cost of providing the necessary nutrients to prevent malnutrition initially.

MANY CHALLENGES STILL TO BE MET

Despite the obvious progress of the child nutrition programs, there are many challenges still to be met, notably the goal to reach a larger proportion of the total child population and to provide more meals at little or no cost to needy children.

Of the more than 25 million children now receiving Type A lunches, 8.5 million have been declared eligible for free and reduced price lunches on the basis of economic need. This number is more than double that of 3 years earlier, but still fails to include all children who are unable to pay.

Child nutrition programs have an equal obligation to children in all economic groups. The concern of poor food habits is not limited to those on low incomes. Inadequate diets appear at all income levels. Mothers from more affluent homes may also have outside jobs and changing life styles which can result in haphazard meal schedules and poor food choices. Children from such homes may, therefore, be as nutritionally needy as those from homes at poverty level.

All children who are inadequately fed at home depend heavily on child nutrition programs. The noon lunch is often the only real meal of the school day. An important concern, therefore, is that it be made an especially nutritious meal.

In recognition of this aim, the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health (1969) recommended that needy children receive amounts of nutrients in their school lunch equivalent to one-half or more of the R.D.A. (Recommended Daily Allowance) instead of the presently specified one-third.

Nutrition education in calssrooms and lunchrooms is an overriding requisite in all child nutrition programs. Even if, or when, school lunch is available in every school, the job will not be finished. There still will be children who do not buy these meals and there will be those who buy them but eat only a portion of the food served and waste the remainder.

Children must have the knowledge and the judgment to select and eat the foods necessary for good nutrition. This can come only through nutrition education which must be a part of the discipline of very child from kindergarten through grade 12.

I feel that every school child should have a school lunch available to him. I am especially concerned that the 5 million children in this country (many depending solely on a school lunch) should not go to bed hungry.

We are happy to be included in the new coalition of the Jaycees. Thank you for the privilege of appearing before the Select Committee.

Senator HART. Thank you.

I take it that the study that was made on children in Massachusetts is the one cited in footnote 2?

Mrs. KRAUS. Yes. That is the one.

Senator HART. I assume that D. L. Callahan conducted the study?

Mrs. KRAUS. D. L. Callahan conducted the study under the direction of the Massachusetts State Department of Education and Nutrition.

Senator HART. Do we have a copy of that study?

Mrs. KRAUS. Yes, you do.

Senator HART. If there is no objection, I think we will have it printed in the record.[1]

This nutrition education you described that the Auxiliary is attempting, how does it work?

VOLUNTEERS SET UP NUTRITION EDUCATION COURSES

Mrs. KRAUS. We started in Massachusetts 3 years ago, and our prime effort was to educate doctors' wives in basic nutrition facts, which we did through professional people.

These women then have been asked to go into the community to assist in various ways to start nutrition education programs in the schools. Nutrition education is not part of the curriculum in Massachusetts, and many of these volunteer women have set up small minicourses in nutrition education, with the assistance of professional people, in the schools.

The Board of Education has been encouraging us to do this so that the general public and the general feeling of the superintendents and the schools and so forth will realize the importance of this.

Senator HART. You have not had a problem of the superintendents and so forth objecting to the use of the schoolrooms for this purpose?

Mrs. KRAUS. No. Most of them we have approached on this point have been very receptive.

Senator HART. I understand it is wholly voluntary?

Mrs. KRAUS. It is. There is no money supporting this. We are working on a volunteer basis, and many of the women are not trained nutritionists, as I explained. We are working as catalysts.

The Dairy Council has been most helpful, the Massachusetts Council on Food and Nutrition has been helpful, and many local doctors have come to our aid, school nurses, and so forth, have assisted us in putting on such a program in the schools.

Senator HART. It is some comfort to know that doctors' wives also need to learn what is good nutrition. I am not sure the meals we have in our house will pass anybody's test.

Mrs. KRAUS. There has been a statement made by someone that we are a nation of nutritional illiterates, and I think this goes for physicians' wives as well as any other people.

---

[1] See Appendix, p. 469.

Mr. STONE. I just have a few questions before we get to Mr. Temple-West.

Did you use the curriculum of the Dairy Council, or did you develop your own?

Mrs. KRAUS. I worked very closely with the University of Massachusetts Agricultural Extension Service; a Miss Harriet Wright, who is Professor of Nutrition, worked very closely with me, and Dr. Mayer assisted us at Harvard; and we were able to arrange a rather complete, or very good curriculum.

Mr. STONE. Could you forward a copy of your curriculum to this committee?

Mrs. KRAUS. Yes, I would be happy to.[1]

Mr. BENEDICT. Our final witness is Patrick Temple-West of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

STATEMENT OF PATRICK TEMPLE-WEST, DIRECTOR, NUTRITIONAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, ARCHDIOCESE OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. My name is Patrick Temple-West, and I am the director of the Nutritional Development Services of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia. Nutritional Development Services sponsors Federal child feeding programs within the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Thank you for inviting me to testify before this committee about what is being done and what can be done to introduce child feeding programs into schools without them.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank this committee for the leadership role it has taken in bringing the problem of hunger before the American people. Before a person can do something about a problem he has to know it exists. The reports of this committee have been most helpful in convincing school officials that there is a need for child feeding programs in their schools, and they have been a source of inspiration and encouragement to me personally.

My specialty is dealing with Catholic schools, so I shall confine my remarks to child feeding programs in these schools. I shall discuss a method of reaching nonprogram schools that has worked well for us in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

PARTICIPATION PLAN WORKS IN PHILADELPHIA

About 3 years ago the Archdiocese of Philadelphia had approximately 300 elementary parochial schools with a total enrollment of 165,000 students. Prior to 3 years ago each parochial school that wanted a National School Lunch Program had to perform all the necessary tasks itself and communicate directly with the State Educational Agency or the Regional Office of the USDA Food and Nutrition Service. Of the 300 elementary schools, no more than 20 participated in the National School Lunch Program.

Seeing this situation and desiring to expand participation in the National School Lunch Program, the Archdiocese formulated a plan to accomplish this. The essence of the plan was through a centrally administered program, to make the National School Lunch Program readily available to any school wishing to participate.

---

[1] See Appendix, pp. 471–491

The first step was to retain a full-time diocesan school lunch coordinator. I was given that position; I obtained my salary through a private grant. My function was to act as sponsor for the schools to be brought into the National School Lunch Program, and to provide all administrative and logistic services that the school lunch called for. I was to do collectively what each school would have had to do on its own.

We devised a three-phase plan that would eventually enable every school in the archdiocese to participate with a minimum of effort in the National School Lunch Program.

Our resources for carrying out this plan were little more than a desire to feed hungry children because we had very little money. Nevertheless, we had the two essential keys to success: a full-time diocesan school lunch coordinator and a plan for him to carry out.

We wanted to introduce the National School Lunch Program into the neediest schools first because here was the greatest need and also the greatest resources in terms of Federal aid. To do this we needed a temporary, centrally-administered food service that would provide hot meals for a very low capital outlay—these schools had no facilities and we had very little money—a food service that could be operated economically at the very low volumes with which we were starting, and one that could be run entirely by volunteers.

There was no such system, so we invented one. This was the cup-can system which is now in use throughout the country.

In developing the cup-can system we worked very closely with the Northeast Regional Office of the USDA Food and Nutrition Service and with the USDA Nutrition and Technical Services. In fact, throughout our 3-year history we have worked very closely with these two agencies and have only the highest praise for their understanding and cooperation.

Once we had the cup-can system we then entered into the first phase of our three-phase plan. The objectives of the first phase were to:

1. Provide especially needy schools with a hot lunch program immediately.
2. Build up the confidence of Catholic school administrators in the National School Lunch Program and our ability to administer it.
3. Increase the volume of meals served so that we would be able to employ a more sophisticated food service.
4. Put the central administration on a financially self-sufficient basis.

Each of these objectives were reached during the first full year of operation. At the close of the 1971–72 school year we were serving 2,000 cup-can meals to needy children each day. For the continued success of the program the most important objective in this phase was that the central administration become financially self-sufficient, which, basically, means to be able to support the salary of the diocesan school lunch coordinator.

The second phase had as its major goal the transfer to a more sophisticated type of food service that would in itself encourage more schools to participate in the National School Lunch Program. The objectives of the second phase were to:

1. Establish a permanent, sophisticated food service.
2. Expand into the rest of the especially needy schools.
3. Reduce the per meal cost so as to make the food service available to schools not qualifying as especially needy.

The first two of these objectives were reached during the 1972–73 school year. We served 6,000 meals a day to needy children through a first class, preplate satellite system. The third objective needs some explanation. During the first 2 years of operation we concentrated on feeding children attending especially needy schools. This enabled us to receive special assistance funds in excess of the average special assistance reimbursement. In order to serve the same meal in a school not qualifying as an especially needy school we would have to reduce the cost of the meal to where we could make ends meet with the average special assistance reimbursement.

We were able to obtain some cost reductions last year but the rising food costs wiped out every reduction we made so that the net effect was for us to stand still. We anticipate that the legislation now before Congress to increase the financial assistance to the School Lunch Program will enable us to attempt to feed the needy child in a school not qualifying as especially needy.

The third and final phase of the plan has as its objective to expand the program to all schools in the archdiocese that need it. We would have begun to start on this phase this school year if the rise in food prices had not derailed us. Hopefully, this new legislation will put us back on the track.

SLOW, STEADY PROGRESSION

The plan I have described to bring parochial schools without lunch programs into the National School Lunch Program is a slow, steady progression. It moves as fast as resources become available. It has taken us 2½ years to reach this point. It has not been fast enough for some and too fast for others. But the plan has worked—35 especially needy schools now have a school food service where previously they never had a hope of getting one. Furthermore, it is only a matter of time before every school that needs it in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia will have a food service.

We are talking to people in other dioceses and encouraging them to follow our example. Each situation is different and will call for different planning. But without diocesan school lunch coordinators and thoughtful planning, we do not feel that any significant dent would have been made in the number of Catholic schools without a food service in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

We feel that this is a good model for others to follow. If Congress and the USDA intends to reach every nonprogram school then they should give consideration to assisting dioceses with funds and technical assistance to help them establish diocesan coordinators.

Thank you, sir.

Senator HART. Thank you.

Is it fair to ask the source of your salary? You described it as private.

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. I get my salary through a philanthropic businessman in Philadelphia. I don't want to go into it much further than that; but, as I said, within the first year of operation, my salary was carried by the lunch program. We became self-sufficient, and I did not have to rely on outside funding for my salary.

Senator HART. The chronology that you describe is applicable in the archdioceses, and I take it that is the kind of specific recommendation you would make to other applicants that are seeking to expand their use of this program?

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. Yes, or initiate, Senator, not only expand.

Senator HART. While this, clearly, is not within the immediate scope of this committee—have you had any static at all from those who feel that tax moneys should not be processed through nonpublic schools with respect to this program?

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. No.

Senator HART. The question should not be construed as suggesting there should be.

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. I understand.

Senator HART. Do you know whether Westwood Catholic High School for boys participates in the food program?

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. No, it does not.

Senator HART. I was a graduate of that school in 1930.

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. St. Thomas Moore High School has a breakfast program. It is at 47th and Wyalusing.

Senator HART. Thank you very much.

Does staff have questions?

Mr. STONE. I have just one.

You are still using the Philadelphia catering service; you are not cooking your own?

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. No, we are not.

Mr. STONE. Do you have plans to?

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. At this stage, no, we don't.

Mr. STONE. When you made a contract with the catering service this year, you did not have an escalating clause?

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. No. We were very careful. I think we got a very good deal.

I may say that we have made a habit of using the resources available to us. If there is just so much money available to us, we will use that, and make the best possible use of it. As I said, we will go faster as resources become available.

Mr. STONE. Once you have gone beyond those schools, everyone in the community can recognize the need, and you get to those schools that have students that pay what they can afford to pay.

Are you having a greater problem expanding your program in schools where there are students who appear to be more affluent?

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN PROGRAM EXPANSION

Mr. TEMPLE-WEST. Yes. We are unable to break out of the especially needy school area into a school, say, that has 50 percent free on reduced price, or 30 percent.

Mr. **Stone**. There still may be in those schools a large percentage——

Mr. **Temple-West**. Yes. The definition of the schools varies from 75 percent especially needy. If we have 74 percent, it does not qualify. We couldn't serve them. Hopefully, and I am pretty certain that with this new legislation we will be able to, with the increased reimbursement.

Senator **Hart**. I hope you are right.

Mr. Benedict, while listening to the several witnesses since I have got here, I have been leafing through testimony that you gave as we opened, and—I would like to before we close—I would like to express my delight and appreciation at the effort made to organize the coalition. It will be enormously helpful, I know.

Mr. **Benedict**. Thank you very much.

Senator **Hart**. I have a feeling that if middle Americans would coalesce and study a lot of these problems, we would discover that there are far fewer deadbeats and vastly greater merit than the middle American's general conversation would lead me to believe.

Mr. **Benedict**. I think the realization that when one of us loses, we all lose, is something that is fast being realized.

Senator **Hart**. It is a speech everybody makes, but I am not sure how much understanding really attaches to it. I really don't. But it is great, this coalition.

Mr. **Benedict**. I hope the testimony of the Jaycees and the coalition has been helpful. It comes from a wide background of occupations and organizations and concerns, with one thing in common. They believe there is no greater investment than feeding America's children.

Senator **Hart**. You can't get mad at the critics of the system if they say: "Well, the country can't even feed its own children." If you can't do something that, as far as I know, nobdy objects to, how are we going to get done those things to which a lot of people object?

Thank you very much.

The committee is in recess, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 1 p.m., the Select Committee was recessed.]

APPENDIX

ITEM 1—SUBMITTED BY WITNESSES

FROM ROBERT M. BENEDICT

THE AMERICAN LEGION

Although The American Legion national organization is not represented at this meeting, they have given their wholehearted support to the endeavors of the Jaycees and their Improved Child Nutrition Program.

PAUL R. FRINSTHAL,
Assistant Director,
Americanism and Children and Youth,
The American Legion

Report of the Convention Committee on Children and Youth to the 56th National Convention of The American Legion, held in Honolulu, Hawaii, August 21st, 22nd and 23rd, 1973.

We agreed upon the following report, which is respectfully submitted for your consideration. As part of that report, The American Legion adopted Resolution No. 441 on Adequate Nutrition for School Children, and now has it as a part of its mandated position, and it reads as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 441—ADEQUATE NUTRITION FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

WHEREAS, there has been an expression of concern by health authorities and various national organizations with an interest in the status of proper nutrition among young people; and

WHEREAS, the Federal School Lunch Program and other federally supported nutrition programs have demonstrated their worth, as evidenced by a reduction in health problems, improved school proficiency among children, and a reduction in the drop out rate; and

WHEREAS, there are many school systems throughout the United States that do not participate in the federal-state supported School Lunch Program; and

WHEREAS, spiraling food costs are endangering the continued operation of this valuable program in some localities; and

WHEREAS, since 1941, The American Legion has supported the Federal School Lunch Program and other related programs of nutrition for children;

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION IN NATIONAL CONVENTION ASSEMBLED IN HONOLULU, HAWAII, AUGUST 21ST, 22ND AND 23RD, 1973, that American Legion Posts located in communities without an adequate school nutrition program cooperate with other interested organizations and school authorities to the end that adequate school nutrition programs may be established and maintained in such communities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Congress of the United States and various state legislatures are urged to appropriate sufficient funds for school nutrition programs to reflect the increased cost of food.

FROM ROBERT K. CHERRY

ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM
130 SOUTH GREEN STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607
666-4011 · 577-3200

	COST PER CASE		COST PER PORTION		INCREASE PER MEAL
CANNED GOODS	1972	1973	1972	1973	
Peanut Butter	11.62	18.10	.0346	.0539	.0193
Applesauce	6.45	6.92	.0239	.0256	.0017
Peaches	7.90	8.09	.0329	.0337	.0008
Pudding	7.20	9.22	.0267	.0341	.0074
Lima Beans	7.30	8.78	.0304	.0366	.0062
Apricots	9.45	12.06	.0394	.0503	.0109
Green Beans	5.65	7.12	.0235	.0297	.0062
Oranges .	4.25	5.50	.0170	.0020	.005
Apples	8.50	12.50	.0340	.0500	.0160
Nectarines	4.50	6.50	.0450	.0650	.0200
Frozen Whole Eggs (lb.)	.28	.65			
Plastic Utensils	1.65	2.15	.00165	.00215	.0005
Milk (Average Price)	.0650	.0775			.0215
Hot Dogs*	.76	1.09	.095	.136	.04125
Ground Beef**	.87	1.19	.1452	.1987	.0535
Ground Pork	.83	1.375	.1485	.2460	.0975
Ground Turkey	.55	.88	.0790	.1264	.0474
Beef Patties	.95	1.07	.11875	.13375	.015
Ham	.865	1.475	.1081	.1844	.0763
Chicken	.45	.89	.1125	.2225	.1100
Dicked Pork	.90	1.54	.1610	.2755	.1145
Fish Squares	.43	.53	.0538	.0663	.0125
Fish Sticks	.34	.51	.0425	.0638	.0213

* Hot dogs used last year were all beef—this year the hot dogs are all meat.

** Ground Beef—last year pure beef—this year soya added.

THESE PAGES WERE omitted
~~THIS PAGE WAS MISSING~~ FROM THE DOCUMENT THAT WAS
SUBMITTED TO ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.
P. 453 TO 470

WOMAN'S AUXILIARY TO THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, INC.

Nutrition Education Course

Seminar I

Key Nutrients – How Body Uses Food
9:30 A.M. - noon
Cooperative Extension County and State Staff

Seminar II

A Balanced Diet with reference to weight control,
fad diets, protein, fats, vitamins and minerals
Dept. of Nutrition Staff Harvard School
of Public Health and U. of Mass.

Seminar III

Diets Through Life; Pregnancy, Infancy, Early Growth
and Development and Adult Life, the Elderly.
Dept. of Nutrition Harvard School of Public Health,
Nutrition and Food Dept., U. of Mass. Cooperative Extension
Staff of U. of Massachusetts

Seminar IV

An adequate diet
at different levels of cost. Food Source
Dept. of Nutrition, Harvard School of Public Health,
Nutrition and Food Dept., U. of Mass. Cooperative Extension
Staff of U. of Massachusetts

Seminar V

Food Assistance programs in Massachusetts
Staff, Bureau of Nutrition Education
and School Food Services

Seminar VI

Nutrition Education in Massachusetts
Panel Representatives Mass. Dept. of Public Health
Office of Education – Bureau of Nutrition, Education and
School Food Services, Mass. Cooperative Extension Service.
Panel as Indicated

Seminar VII

"Big" Ideas in Nutrition Education --
Behavioral Objectives – Cultural Patterns
Staff, New England and Dairy and Food Council

Seminar VIII

Role of Volunteer Opportunities for
Volunteers in Nutrition Education
To be planned by service Agencies

JANUARY 12

Luncheon in Boston – Place to be announced

This will mark the end of the nutrition education and the beginning of the volunteer service program. Certificates of Participation will be awarded.

woman's auxiliary

TO THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, INC.

NUTRITION EDUCATION

PACKAGE PROGRAM CONTENTS:

1. INTRODUCTORY PAGE
2. EXPLANATORY SHEET
3. NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR DOCTORS' WIVES
4. SUGGESTIONS FOR CURRICULUM
5. PROGRAM PREPARATION
6. FACT SHEET
7. THE ROLE OF THE VOLUNTEER FOR ASSISTANCE IN FEEDING PROGRAM
8. SUGGESTIONS FOR PLACES WHERE VOLUNTEERS CAN WORK AFTER THEIR TRAINING
9. PROMOTIONAL AIDS
10. AGENCIES TO CALL UPON FOR ASSISTANCE
11. MOVIES ON NUTRITION
12. BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR NUTRITION AND NUTRITION EDUCATION
13. SUGGESTED SPEECH

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

INTRODUCTORY PAGE

Nutrition is a vital part of our lives from birth to death. And, its requirements are ever-changing with our age and are determined by our body size and our basic metabolic rate.

Calories are produced during the metabolism of fats, proteins and carbohydrates. These, plus vitamins and minerals are essential for the building and the maintenance of a healthy body.

Our needs might be divided as: an infant, a child, an adolescent, an adult, during pregnancy or as an aging adult. We require a different number of calories during each stage and according to the type of life we lead.

In this package program we hope your auxiliary will find ways to educate your members and the public about good nutrition.

Many good materials are available to you, and we hope you will involve as many people in your community as possible.

Maintenance of good health depends upon many things. Nutrition plays an important part in establishing our life-style. You will learn how to improve your own nutrition and that of your family.

And, you will learn how and where you can be of assistance, as a volunteer, to help others in your community.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

EXPLANATORY SHEET

Why is it important for you to understand nutrition?

Each of you can be a key person to whom many homemakers look for advice and information on questions concerning the health of their families. The physician is consulted when a medical problem is involved, but you are in a unique position to help homemakers recognize the important part food can play in promoting and protecting health.

Good nutrition is vital to normal growth and development of children and to help maintain physical well-being in adults. You can help homemakers recognize this and, equally important, you can lead them to discover ways to work toward optimum nutrition for themselves and their families.

Why is this understanding important to the homemaker?

Although other family members sometimes share in the responsibility for shopping and food preparation, the homemaker controls, to a large extent, what is served at mealtime in her home. You can improve the nutrition of your own family, as well. The homemaker wants her family to have nutritious meals. She wants her children to have the foods they need for normal growth and body development. She wants to protect her family's health.

Yet, it is only when the mother has a basic understanding of the family's food needs and knows what constitutes good meal plans that she can begin to work realistically toward her goals. The homemaker needs to feel comfortable, though, about the nutrition information that she is given. She needs to feel that successful meal planning is something she can accomplish.

CHECK UP ON YOURSELF

How are your own food habits? It's important to practice the principles of nutrition which you are trying to get across to others. And do you have and know the correct food habits. Your personal experience in checking your own food habits against daily food requirement charts will help you interpret these needs to others.

UNDERSTAND YOUR AUDIENCE

You may be working with a wide variety of families, from many cultural and economic backgrounds, from different geographic origins and ethnic groups. You will need to know something of the social characteristics and food patterns of these groups. Don't just assume that everything they have been eating for many years is not correct. Sometimes there is good food value in what they are eating, but perhaps needs some supplementation. Try to motivate people to change some of their food practices by adding certain foods. It is said that people will change their mode of dressing when in a new environment, much more quickly than they will change their food habits.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR DOCTORS' WIVES

So you want to start a program to train the wives of physicians in nutrition?

Such a program has been carried out, successfully, in the state of Massachusetts, and your groups can do it, too. This Nutrition Education Course was offered, mainly, to the wives of physicians, but many other interested homemakers discovered it and wanted to learn more about this important subject. This course can be offered to other groups, such as the wives of dentists, to name but one.

This package program contains a reprint of the article on the program in Massachusetts, from MD'S WIFE.

It is sometimes difficult to integrate into ethnic groups. The course can be offered to the wives of Spanish, or other Latin American doctors or the wives of black physicians. Upon completion of the course, they can return to their communities with this new knowledge and work with their own people.

The very first thing you should do is obtain the approval of your local medical society, as you do when you begin any new project.

It would be helpful to contact a local professor of nutrition, a trained nutritionist or a doctor who is interested in this field.

Plan your financing, and ask your medical society for help, if necessary.

Put together a committee. They do not need to be experts in the field of nutrition, but it would be helpful if some of them have had some experience. The home economists in your county and at your utility company, are an excellent resource of help.

Sit down with your professional person, and work out a course that will meet the particular needs of your community.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

SUGGESTIONS FOR CURRICULUM

1. Key Nutrients.....How the body uses the food we eat.

2. A balanced diet with particular reference to weight control, fad diets, proteins, fats, vitamins and minerals.

3. Diets through life, pregnancy, infancy, early growth and development, adult life and the elderly.

4. An adequate diet at different levels of cost -- food sources.

5. Nutrition education in your particular state.
    a. What do the schools offer?
    b. Do you have supervised lunches at school?
    c. Do you have school breakfasts?
    d. Are there pre-natal clinics?
    e. Is there an area which is concerned with maternal and infant care?
    f. What is being done for the elderly?
    g. What kind of food assistance programs are there in your state?
    h. Are there assistants available to teach cooking of commodity foods?

6. Big ideas in nutrition education, behavioral objectives and cultural patterns.

7. The role of the volunteer and her opportunity in nutrition education.

This is a suggested list to give you ideas. You will not train people to be nutritionists, but they will be able to initiate programs in different areas and act as a catalyst for nutrition education.

It is, therefore, recommended that you stay away from special diets, such as diets for low cholesterol, heart, diabetes, etc. You are primarily going to be able to learn and teach the basic facts.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

Program Preparation

Appoint a Nutrition Chairman.

She need not be a dietician or a nutritionist. An auxiliary volunteer may take the role of catalyst to get a nutrition education program off the ground! The chairman will organize and make the necessary contacts but the professional people will teach the committee.

You should get the approval of the medical society and the general approval of your membership to carry through with this program successfully.

Appoint a committee to handle the educational program. The committee should work closely with professional people or perhaps one professional person could be an advisor to this group. The committee must come up with the following recommendations:

1. Curriculum.
2. Meeting places.
3. Time of seminars and the length.
4. Time of year to start. It is a good idea to have them consecutive so that there will be continuity.
5. Decide whether or not to charge a registration and enrollment fee for this course or to have the expenses paid for by the auxiliary.
6. Decide whether or not you would want to include any other interested homemakers or some other particular organization such as the dentists' wives who also have organized auxiliaries and who are greatly in nutrition education.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

FACT SHEET*

Q. Is poverty the main cause of malnutrition?

A. No.

Q. What are other contributing factors responsible for malnutrition?

A. Illness, ignorance of the relation of diet to health, indifference, loneliness and mental illness.

Q. When you say ignorance, do you mean just not knowing that you should eat the basic four in your diet every day?

A. No, not just that, it could mean ignorance of the need for certain nutrients for example, table salt as a source of iodine. Ignorance, indifference and poverty combine to expose the child to the risk of malnutrition.

Q. Which age is most vulnerable to the effects of malnutrition?

A. Is has been firmly established that preschool-aged children are most vulnerable to the effects of malnutrition.

Q. Can obesity, too, be a form of malnutrition?

A. Yes, ironically it can be and is a condition resulting from a combination of excessive caloric intake and inadequate caloric expenditure.

Q. What is the estimate on the percentage of Americans who are obese? Would you say 20 percent, 40 percent, 60 percent or 65 percent?

A. 40 percent.

Q. What are the dangers when an obese person begins to diet?

A. Malnutrition can develop, if the person follows some of the ill-advised weight reduction (crash) programs, frequently used by adolescents and young women.

Q. Can you tell the audience some of the insidious manisfestations of malnutrition?

*Facts are taken from the Council on Foods and Nutrition Report to the AMA Board of Trustees.

A. It can be found under many situations. Classical malnutrition particularly from vitamin deficiency disease is only a small segment. The less dramatic manifestations of malnutrition are growth retardation, weight loss, increased burden of chronic diseases, depression, weakness, retarded convalescence from disease and trauma, poor performance in pregnancy. The possibility of brain damage and central nervous system development associated with severe and early protein malnutrition in the pregnant mother and early infancy has not been fully established, but there is a strong possibility that it is a cause.

Q. What are the effects of malnutrition and hunger on our society?

A. Hunger damages the moral and economic fiber of the nation, no matter what the reason is for its existence. The cost in human waste is great indeed and the effect in terms of future performance cannot be accurately measured. The poorly nourished child, the hungry child will have a shortened attention span which interferes with learning even though there be no mental impairment.

Q. Is it important for the pregnant mother to have a good diet?

A. Yes, it is extremely important. Information begins to show a cycle of events which embraces the low-birth weight infant. Poor nutritional status during pregnancy is one of several factors related to low birth weight infants. In progression, the infant is in danger of serious malnutrition which if uncorrected can lead to growth depression, and possibly to mental retardation.

Q. What can the woman's auxiliary do to help?

A.
1. We can support the AMA by learning more about the causes, effects of hunger and malnutrition.
2. We can study and help others to learn how to prevent malnutrition.
3. We can help in food delivery systems.
4. We can become active in consumer food programs.
5. We can help with long range programs to improve the nutritional status of all Americans.
6. We must become more educated and more aware of the importance of good nutrition.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

THE ROLE OF THE VOLUNTEER FOR ASSISTANCE IN FEEDING PROGRAM

Volunteers from all groups as well as individuals can get involved in feeding people who need to be fed, the young, the old, the disabled, the sick and needy.

You may be aware of people in your community who are in need of a more adequate diet and who need your help or cooperation in getting it. People who have been involved in this volunteer effort tell us that the first step is to learn about the nutrition problems in your community. Then set priorities and direct your efforts towards specific, immediate food needs. Once you have the facts and have determined the direction in which you are planning to direct your efforts, you and the community officials should determine what resources are available to make the programs go. If your resources are limited and the need is great, we suggest that you look into the additional federal-state help available, especially in low-income areas and neighborhoods. Your community may be able to get extra help even if part of your city or town is made up of middle and high-income families.

I. CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

For school lunch, breakfast and food service for preschool and day care programs you will need the following:

A place to serve children
Kitchen facilities
Someone knowledgeable to plan, prepare and serve the meals, including free or reduced price lunches.

II. FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

For the donated foods program, local responsibilities include:

Facilities to store and distribute the donated foods.
People to give out the foods.
Arrangements through the welfare department to accept applications and verify the need of families who apply for donated foods.
Federal funds are available to states to improve and expand donated foods programs.

III. FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The Food Stamp Program requires at the local level:

Arrangements through the welfare department to accept applications and verify the need of families applying for food stamps.
Storage and issuance of the stamps to eligible families under the same security required to handle money.
An account for payments.

COMMUNITY HELP

Local civic and voluntary organizations can make all the difference in the success of your efforts to build effective food programs. Work to build interest and support from local community groups.

Ask these organizations to consider taking an active part in bringing new or expanded food programs to your community, or to improve these programs so they may better serve those in need.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

SUGGESTIONS FOR PLACES WHERE VOLUNTEERS CAN WORK AFTER THEIR TRAINING

Promote nutrition education through the schools. Assist with the school breakfasts if they are done in your community. Solicit assistance and support from both the PTA and the Women's League of Voters. They are most sympathetic to this kind of project and very often will be extremely helpful on any civic program of this kind.

Work through your community hospital committees; there are opportunities to follow up patients who are released from hospitals with special diets. The hospital dietician and nutritionist may have other jobs within her department that you could assist with.

What kind of assistance to adolescents and teen-agers is there in your high school or junior high. There are many young pregnant, unwed girls who need advice on diet. Many are on macrobiotic diets or other fad diets which bring injury to the fetus. Consult your school nurses and ask for permission to bring advice and literature into the school. Perhaps with the assistance of the nurse you could set up a room with materials, and have it staffed with a knowledgeable person to give out information on the importance of the proper diet for all young people especially the pregnant young student.

County agriculture extension offices in each area are over-worked and under-staffed. They will cheerfully accept your assistance as a volunteer. There will be a variety of places where they can assign you.

How are the elderly in your community doing? Look into the elderly housing projects. In some cases lunches can be planned for these people. In many cases they will welcome you with open arms, will help you prepare the lunches. Many of these older people are lonely. They may have been accustomed to cooking for a large family, and just don't know how to cook for one or two. They will welcome the opportunity to become involved with you. During this time you can offer assistance to them to help them shop and advise them on how to buy for one or two in small quantities. Perhaps you can arrange to take them shopping and carry their bundles for them.

Once people in a community know you are interested in assisting them, you will find innumerable situations coming up in which you can help. There will be many more than mentioned here. There are always particular problems to particular areas.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

PROMOTIONAL AIDS

Contact your local TV station and ask for public service time. Some department of mental health programs can use your help in promoting assistance to the elderly. On one 15-minute program or interview one woman offered a booklet titled Food Guide for the Elderly. She had more than 300 requests for this booklet, which were mailed out.

The Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, will put you on their mailing list to receive the plentiful foods bulletins and other materials from the Information Division. Ask them to send you a plentiful supply each week, and take them to your local super market. Station a few women there to hand out the information to help people choose economical and nutritional foods when they shop. Or just see to it that they are at the market and available to people who want them. Or get public service time on radio or TV and give out this information once each week.

If you live in an area or want to work in an area of Spanish-speaking people, ask for the material, pamphlets, etc., to come to you in Spanish as well as English.

Soon the material will be available in Chinese as well, through the work of a group which is trying to get all of these materials printed in Chinese.

Refer to pamphlet in folder--"Your Plentiful Foods Program"--for address of government agency in your area.

Offer a service in your community to the elderly or homebound people. It can be offered on the radio, or through your local newspaper. One volunteer could assume the responsibility of one person, or of several, to take them shopping each week, or to shop for them each week. This is a good time to get in your points on the importance of the proper foods.

Know all about your particular state, city or community policy on food assistance or stamp programs. Contact the welfare agency in your community. See to it that all eligible people for food assistance programs are getting what they have a right to. Many elderly low income people do not know they are eligible.

Are there some groups who do not know how to use the commodity foods? Find out from your local extension offices if there is a nutritionist who could teach you something about commodity foods, appetizing and useful ways to use them, so that you can assist those who need to know this.

Do you have day care centers in your area? Are they getting food assistance from the government? Are they offering nutritionally balanced meals to the children? Do they need you to help shop for these day care centers?

Do you have any Headstart programs, or health start programs? Can they use your know how and volunteer assistance?

Whomever you choose on your committee should understand that this is not just a one-shot project, not any of these. You will find that once you start things rolling, it will have far reaching results, and you should prepare to continue your project for some time to come. It is not good for our reputation or for the recipient to start something and then drop it. Look into the future and be realistic and determine if this is something you want to continue for the next few years.

COMMUNITY HELP

Local civic and voluntary organizations can make all the difference in the success of your efforts to build effective food programs. Work to build interest and support from local community groups.

Ask these organizations to consider taking an active part in bringing new or expanded food programs to your community, or to improve these programs so they may better serve those in need.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

AGENCIES TO CALL UPON FOR ASSISTANCE

1. Your local or state Food and Dairy Council.
2. Your Board of Education, Nutrition Department and Health Education Department.
3. The college and university in your community.
4. Cooperative Extension Agriculture County Offices.
5. The Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
6. Your local Dietetic Association.

By working with these people you can plan a series of Seminars , if you wish.

TEXT BOOKS

A text book is a great addition to the course, and the women involved can do extensive reading. Reading assignments can be given at each Seminar. You might obtain them at your local library.

We recommend the following:

> The Family Guide to Better Food and Better Health, by Ronald M. Deutsch--1971 edition.
>
> Introduction to Nutrition, recommended by Harvard College. Written by Guthrues, it is published by Mosby.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

MOVIES ON NUTRITION

FOOD, ENERGY AND YOU; 20 minutes; color; $210.00. Available on loan from Association Films, 2277 Faulkner Road, N. E. Atlanta Georgia 30324

This is an animated series of scenes showing how plants store energy. Shows the body mechanisms that release and use energy from food. For use with teenagers.

FOOD FOR LIFE; 11 minutes; color; available on loan; same address as above.

Compares the food practices and problems of four teenagers from South America, India and the U. S. All suffer from malnutrition.

HOW A HAMBURGER TURNS INTO YOU; 19 minutes; color; $200.00. Available on loan from same address.

Illustrates a 12-year-old boy eating hamburger and how he uses the protein. For use with upper elementary school age or teenagers.

SOMETHING YOU DIDN'T EAT; 10 minutes; color; $3.00. Rental from Walt Disney; 477 Madison Ave, New York, New York.

Emphasizes the importance of obtaining vitamins from food.

THE BEST WAY TO EAT; 30 minutes; color;produced 1959 by Florida Citrus Commission. Available on free loan from Modern Talking Picture Service, 714 Spring Street, N. W., Atlanta 8, Georgia.

Good nutrition from youth to old age.

YOU AND YOUR FOOD; eight minutes; color. Available from Walt Disney, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Illustrates that everything that lives must have food and that good health doesn't just happen but has to be planned.

IMPROVING TEENAGE NUTRITION; 27 Frame slides; set, $8.00; filmstrip $5.50. Available from Photo Lab, Inc., 3825 Georgia Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20011

Slides point out the need for improving nutrition in teenagers and help plan ways to improve teenage nutrition.

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR NUTRITION AND NUTRITION EDUCATION

Nutrition Today. Order from 1140 Connecticut Avenue N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036. This publication is designed for professionals and nonprofessionals. Provides current nutrition information.

American Medical Association-Council on Foods and Nutrition, 535 N. Dearborn St. Chicago, Ill. 60610. Write for list of free publications on nutrition.

Cereal Institute, Incorporated, Education Department, 135 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603 This organization has sponsored research on breakfast. Write for catalog---materials include: "Breakfast Source Book" and filmstrips.

Consumer and Food Economics Research Division, Agriculture Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 20201---Ask to be placed on mailing list of Nutrition Program News, a bimonthly publication.

Florida Citrus Commission. Institutional and School Marketing Department, Lakeland Florida 33802----Nutrition games, posters, etcetera.

Handbook for Volunteers Child Nutrition Programs, Food and Nutrition Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 20250.

How to Buy Food (Como Comprar los Comestibles), A Bilingual Teaching Aid, Information Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 20250. Price 50¢

The Good Foods Coloring Book (El Libro Colorante de las Comidas Buenas-PA-912-S) U. S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Washington, D. C. 20250

Exercise and Weight Control. Available from the American Medical Association.

Food for the Family with Young Children, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Food for Children, U. S. Department of Agriculture

Food for your Table. . . Let's Talk About It, Food and Nutrition Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture

Jimmy has more Fun, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service

Rh Disease- A Blood-Destroying Anemia of the Newborn, American Medical Association MD-Patient Information Service. Single copy 20¢

You Can Help Fight Hunger in America...Donated Foods Handbook for Volunteers, Food and Nutrition Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture

WRITE FOR CATALOG OR TYPE OF NUTRITION MATERIAL PROVIDED BY THE FOLLOWING COMPANIES.

American Bakers Association
1700 Pennsylvania Ave. N. W.
Suite 65, Washington, D. C. 20006

American Dairy Council
20 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Dietetic Association
620 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Institute of Baking
400 East Ontario Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Meat Institute
Department of Public Relations
59 East Van Buren Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Nutrition Foundation, Inc.
99 Park Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10016

Mead Johnson Company
2404 Pennsylvania
Evansville, Indiana 47712

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company
1 Madison Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10010

United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association
777 14th Street N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Poultry and Egg National Board
Home Economics Department
8 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Woman's Auxiliary to the American Medical Association, Inc.

NUTRITION EDUCATION PACKAGE PROGRAM

SUGGESTED SPEECH

Now, as never before, our country is acutely aware of malnutrition -- not necessarily as it relates to underdeveloped countries but as it exists right in our midst. Malnutrition is a broad term which encompasses the entire gamut of conditions ranging from undernutrition to overnutrition. There are hazards associated with malnutrition in either form since it is "an impairment of health and physiological function resulting from the failure of an individual to obtain all the essential nutrients in proper amount and balance."

Because of widespread publicity, public interest in nutrition (or more specifically undernutrition) is now at its peak in this country. The perplexing problems of food and nutrition are social, economic, educational, medical, and political problems. The solutions to the problems, therefore, are not going to be simple and well-defined. The situation is indeed complex!

Hunger and malnutrition are not isolated entities; they are symptoms of a much greater underlying problem of poverty. Improving nutritional status will certainly improve general health status, but, for the most part, this will remove a symptom but not the cause of the difficulty. If, under pressure, we attack this problem too hastily, we may miss the real target. We will all be involved in programs which will be directed toward eliminating hunger and malnutrition. Welfare problems can help alleviate certain discomforts but until the economic situation is corrected, and the individual or family counseled to lead a more healthful existence, poverty and malnutrition will go hand in hand.

If, at times, it seems that our success in such activities is limited, we can remind ourselves that no one group has the total responsibility of nourishing people. Rather, each and every one of us, as members of this community share the responsibility of enabling all people to nourish themselves.

It must be remembered that malnutrition is not necessarily associated with abject poverty; it can also be associated with ignorance and indifference which cuts across all economic strata. In addition, there is secondary malnutrition resulting from specific problems such as disease, alcoholism, drug abuse, and mental illness. For example, many of the nutrition problems of the elderly would be included in this category.

Let us examine, briefly, just how malnutrition can affect our community. Studies have demonstrated that there are very critical periods in the life of the infant and preschool child when both mental and physical development can suffer irreversible stunting. Critical periods include the last three months of fetal development, the first two years during which the brain grows most rapidly, and through the first five years of life when physical development is rapid.

In the underdeveloped countries, considerable attention has been devoted to the problem of malnutrition in very young children. Studies of severely malnourished infants have uncovered some truly astonishing findings related to linear and brain growth. In the business of die casting, when the die is cast from the mold and has cooled, it is complete except for rounding of the edges. This, however, is definitely not the case when the "die is cast" for the human organism at birth. The brain begins its most rapid growth after birth. Growth of the brain continues for the next two or three years. In addition, the central nervous system is not fully developed at birth, and skeletal growth potential has not yet been fully programmed.

Severe malnutrition during the first years of life interferes with normal brain and central nervous system development. It is impossible, however, to discount the social and environmental influences when evaluating the role of malnutrition on learning behavior.

Now, we may say that it is highly unlikely that many youngsters in the U. S. suffer prolonged setbacks of such severity as to jeopardize their learning potential. Is this, however, truly a reflection of the situation as it exists? Children in our schools who are classified as "slow learners" may, in fact, be poorly nourished and the fatigue and lassitude which they display may be symptoms directly related to improper eating habits, and not a reflection on their intelligence.

Malnutrition attributable to ignorance is a common situation as in the case of the well-meaning mother who thoroughly boils everything she feeds her baby, thus destroying many nutrients. People who send their children off to school without breakfast are uninformed of the necessity and importance of this meal. There are numerous examples of nutritional illiteracy; the fact that good information is available does not necessarily mean that it will reach the people who need it most. Are there, in fact, youngsters who through poverty, ignorance, or idiosyncrasy are improperly nourished during these important years?

In spite of recent surveys which have revealed a significant amount of undernutrition in certain sections of the United States, the major nutritional problem of our country continues to be overnutrition, more commonly referred to as obesity. There is probably no better index to our general lack of health and fitness than the incidence of obesity in this country. Prevention of obesity is much simpler than treating obesity, and the time to be concerned with obesity is during childhood. Did you know that 75 to 80 percent of obese youngsters do not lose their so-called "baby fat" but, rather, turn into obese adults? Thus, the first link in the chain of this major health hazard is usually traced to infancy and childhood. The years of growth can set the scene for the great tragedy of weight gain.

Additional evidence that man's destiny can be changed by nutrition may be found in certain research studies. The cells of most tissues of the body, like liver and skin, are constantly being broken down and rebuilt and can regenerate themselves. However, there are tissues such as adipose or fat tissue which apparently do not recycle; once the final number of cells is formed, the tissue is set. The cells perform their function but do not break down and rebuild. There is increasing evidence which suggests that the absolute number of fat tissue cells can be changed during the first years of life by the number of calories fed the infant. Gross overfeeding of the infant may produce four times as many adipose tissue cells as are produced by the normally fed infant.

The pertinence, of course, is that individuals who have been overweight since early childhood may, in fact, now be endowed with a larger than normal number of fat storage cells. The propensity for storage of fat is great -- reduce their weight and you now have a person in perpetual semistarvation. These findings may necessitate quite a different approach to weight control. Thus, the fat baby is necessarily the healthy baby and the pattern for obesity as a way of life is set.

A few decades ago, obesity was frequently attributed to hypothyroidism. About 15 years ago, obesity was regarded largely as a psychological problem -- that is, overeating causes the obesity but the tendency to overeat was considered an abnormal personality trait. Now we know that there is no one simple explanation; an association of many factors is oftern likely. In view of the fact that new methods and approaches to correct obesity are constantly coming into the foreground, it appears that no one suitable method has been discovered which is effective.

One important factor that is frequently overlooked in weight reduction programs is the value of exercise. Direct relationships have been observed between light activity and the increased percentage of body weight in the form of fat. Exercise is essential for the health of muscle and skeletal tissue. A very sedentary individual, although he may observe no significant gain in weight over the years, may actually be gaining body fat at the expense of lean tissue. Fat is deposited in the muscles. On the other hand, the extremely active individual may have an increase of muscle tissue as protein.

At this point, you may be wondering why all this emphasis is being placed on the fact that many people are considerably overweight. The medical profession and laymen alike have come to realize that obesity is certainly not a symptom of good health but rather a prelude to increased morbidity and mortality rates. There is in the obese population a higher incidence of hypertension, cardiovascular and renal diseases, disorders of the liver and gall bladder and diabetes mellitus. Diabetes in the obese individual presents the greatest risk among the relative causes of death with an excess mortality rate, almost four times that of standard risks in both men and women. Obesity is also generally accepted as a hazard for the pregnant woman and the surgical patient. Considering all the health hazards associated with obesity, along with all the time, money, and effort spent on treating obesity it is obvious that the emphasis should be placed on prevention rather than treatment.

Maintaining optimum nutritional status through proper eating habits is an individual responsibility for each and every one of us. We cannot, however, ignore the fact that in our midst we still have people who are hungry and malnourished. As members of this community, we should get personally involved with programs and legislation which are aimed at resolving the health and nutrition problems of our needy citizens. Programs such as the Food Stamp Program which enables needy families to exchange the amount of money normally spent on food for coupons of higher value; the Commodity Food Distribution Program which makes available to needy families approximately 22 food commodities; the National School Lunch Program which provides meals without cost or at reduced prices to children who are determined by local school authorities to be unable to pay the full cost; Project Head Start whose primary aim is to give poor preschool children and educational basis to help them keep up with more advantaged youngsters when they start regular school; these and many others reflect the great concern of those who can do something to help meet the needs of these people. Our concern can best be summarized by John Donne's famous quotation:

> "No man is an island, entire of itself
> Any man's death diminishes me,
> because I am involved in Mankind;
> And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls;
> It tolls for thee."

ITEM 2—FROM OTHER THAN WITNESSES

The Honorable George McGovern

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND GENERAL LEGISLATION,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
September 13, 1973.

Before beginning my formal statement, I want to first extend my congratulations and appreciation to you for convening this hearing of the subcommittee. There are millions of schoolchildren, parents and administrators across the country who, I am sure, are equally appreciative of your efforts on their behalf.

Mr. Chairman, as both a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and as chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I have watched with deep interest the healthy growth of our child nutrition programs over the past several years.

Indeed, there should be little surprise that this growth has occurred—given a strong presidential commitment to providing schoolchildren with adequate nutrition and the determination of the Congress to make that commitment a reality by appropriating the necessary funds.

There is no need for me, today, to repeat the justification for this commitment beyond restating the elementary fact that a hungry child can't learn; and a child who cannot learn will never be able to make his own unique contribution to our society.

Today we have around 25 million schoolchildren participating in the National School Lunch Program, some 8 million of them receiving lunches at free or reduced prices. Moreover, looking to the future, the President and the Congress are committed to extending the benefits of this program to some 17,000 schools and 5 million children who, as yet, have not had the opportunity to participate—because their schools have no programs.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we have all been looking forward to steady progress in our commitment to eliminate hunger from our classrooms. We look forward to offering each and every one of our schoolchildren the best nutrition which this abundant Nation is capable of providing.

HOPE FOR FUTURE ENDANGERED

Now, Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that our expectations in this area are in danger of being shattered. Not only may our forward progress in feeding the children be halted; but much of the progress made heretofore may be reversed.

At this time, I would like to submit as an official part of the committee record a report—"School Food Program Needs: State School Food Service Directors' Response"—prepared by the staff of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. This report documents the dramatic and potentially negative impact that rising prices and costs will have on the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition programs unless the Congress acts—and acts now.

Mr. Chairman, this report was compiled in response to a telegram sent by the Select Committee's staff, in late July, to all the State School Food Service Directors requesting current information on this year's school food service costs, as compared with previous costs, and the effect of these increases on the quality of and participation in the program.

The staff received 42 of these responses—many at length and in great detail—urging action by the Congress. Most of these responses, moreover, were based on costs as of late July or early August. Given price increases since then, I am sure that if the survey was conducted today, the responses would indicate an even greater sense of urgency among child feeding experts across the country.

Based on the information in hand, though, we can state the following with some degree of certainty:

> The average cost of producing a school lunch at current costs across the country is a minimum of 61.4 cents, with a high of 80 to 85 cents and a low of 50 cents.
>
> The average cost of producing a breakfast is 30.4 cents, with a high of about 45 cents and a low of about 10 cents.
>
> The increased cost of a lunch this year is 20 to 24 cents in one State, 10 to 14 cents in 12 States, 5 to 9 cents in 17 States, and less than 5 cents in only three States.
>
> The increased cost of a breakfast is 20 to 24 cents in one State, 10 to 14 cents in one State, 5 to 9 cents in eight States and less than 5 cents in 17 States.

As a result of these increased costs, 29 States are increasing their lunch prices by 5 to 10 cents, one or more States by more than 10 cents and other States by varying amounts. Breakfast prices are going up by like amounts.

Besides higher costs and prices, the States were asked what other kinds of ill-effects would happen to these programs. The answers ranged such as: Decreased participation of paying students and poor students; reduction in quality and variety of meals; and, it was reported in 12 States, schools actually may drop completely out of the program.

Mr. Chairman, the impact of these increased prices on program participation nationwide can be predicted based on previous studies conducted on behalf of the Department of Agriculture. Roughly speaking, the Department's surveys indicate that for every 1 percent increase in meal costs, students drop out at a 1 percent rate.

Therefore, if the costs of meals rise an average of 5 percent, we may lose as many as 5 percent of those students now paying for their lunches. In actual numbers, this means that at least 800,000 students will no longer benefit from the School Lunch Program. If the price increases 10 cents per meal, we may lose 10 percent of the paying students, and so on down the line.

And, any further expansion of the program to the needy poor will be out of the question.

The real tragedy of this crisis, Mr. Chairman, is that the impact is falling hardest on those low- and middle-income working families whose children are not protected by the law entitling children from the poorest families to lunches at no cost.

This tragedy was expressed most clearly in the response by the program director in the State of Missouri who said:

> History has told us that each time we have an increase in the charge for lunches it has the effect of pricing a number of the middle and lower middle-income children out of the program. This is the very group that has represented our major participants in the expansion and growth of the program over the past 28 years. At the same time, we should be reminded that the middle and lower middle-income families represent the largest segment of our tax paying population that are contributing toward sustaining the availability of free lunches for needy children. In many, many instances there is very little difference between the income of these families and those declared to be eligible for free lunches under federally mandated policy regulations. These are the families that are most drastically affected by inflation. Without their continued participation and contributions, we would seriously question the logic in continuing to operate School Food Service Programs strictly for the needy who are guaranteed free lunches by our Federal Government.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I believe these feeding programs are being put in an intolerable situation. I believe these low and middle-income families are being put in an intolerable situation.

The question we must face is this: Is it fair to hundreds of thousands of hard-working low and middle-income families—who already pay more than their fair share of taxes—to price their children out of National School Lunch, a program for which those very taxes are used?

I don't think we can stand by and let that happen. Not as long as we have the power to prevent it.

For that reason, Senator Case and I, along with several of our colleagues, introduced, just yesterday, an Emergency Child Nutrition Bill. This bill seeks to remedy the situation in the following ways.

SEVEN COURSES OF ACTION

First, we would update the Sec. 4 payment for all lunches from 8 to 12 cents. The evidence and cost figures supplied by the States in the Select Committee's report justifies this update.

By adjusting this payment to meet cost increases, we can keep those 800,000 children in the School Lunch Program.

At the same time, we would authorize States to raise the eligibility level for reduced price lunches 25 percent above current levels. This is intended especially for high-cost urban areas to assist thousands of low- and middle-income families. The upper level in these areas for such reduced price lunches would thereby be updated from $6,375 to $7,437.

Second, we would update the Sec. 11 payment for free and reduced price lunches for children from needy families from 40 to 45 cents. This is essential if local school districts are not to go broke while living up to their responsibilities to feed the hungry. It is also essential to assure the nutritional quality we expect in our feeding programs.

Third, we would update the payment for school breakfasts from 5 to 8 cents on a national average, to 15 cents on reduced-price basis and 20 cents on a free basis. The Breakfast Program is now on a financial edge with many schools who run programs debating whether to continue them—and few schools willing to undertake new programs.

Fourth, we would extend the provision enacted earlier this session by Congress providing the States with the cash equivalent of surplus and other commodities that cannot be supplied by the Agriculture Department due to shortages.

Fifth, we would correct an inadvertent error in the language of the new Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants and Children that prohibits participation by our most needy Americans—Indians living on reservations. Having recently held a hearing[1] on the largest reservation in my State, I know how desperately needed is this new program to fight infant malnutrition and high mortality rates.

Sixth, we would seek to set a target date for completing the President's and Congress' commitment to extend the benefits of child nutrition programs to all schoolchildren in the land. As yet, there are some 5 million children attending 17,000 schools denied these nutritional opportunities because their schools have no programs, primarily because they have no equipment.

We have set a target date of September 1, 1976—approximately 3 years from now—to reach these children in these schools and to truly make this a National School Lunch Program. Such an achievement would be a most fitting contribution to the country's bicentennial year.

Seventh—and we consider this especially important—we seek to reemphasize congressional intent regarding the Special Milk Program. We believe that the Department of Agriculture, under pressure from the Office of Management and Budget, has issued restrictive regulations for this program that violate the intent of the Congress.

This may make budgetary sense to OMB, but it makes no nutritional or educational sense to hungry children and harrassed school officials around the Nation.

This bill contains measures that will cost more than the administration has requested for fiscal year 1974. However, each increase only represents an attempt to hold the line—to keep our child nutrition programs functioning at their current, not an expanded, level.

Every American family has felt the pinch from food costs that have risen 20 percent and more in recent weeks. Families have had to reach into other areas of their budgets just to keep their food supply at last year's level.

If we consider our children to be our most vital resource—and not wish to shirk the legislative responsibility we have assumed to supply them with nutritious food—then passage of this emergency bill is a must.

---

[1] *See Federal Food Programs: Part 3—Supplementary Food Programs*; hearing of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, Aug. 28, 1973, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

Senator Humphrey's more inclusive bill, S. 1063, contains sections of the highest importance. Funds for nutrition education and State administrative expenses must be considered and passed this year, if the total integrity of these vital programs is to be maintained. The new but very promising Women, Infant and Children Program needs to be strengthened and expanded and Senator Humphrey's amendment in this area is crucial.

Also, Senator Case's bill, S. 1005, which will prohibit the sale of "junk" vended foods in schools participating in the School Lunch Program. Earlier hearings[1] held by the Select Committee show the fiscal and nutritional damage these foods can do to the program, and thereby, our children.

These concerns need your attention very soon. Our bill only covers what we consider to be those emergency matters that have already hurt the program substantially and cannot wait.

I believe, with intelligent planning, those of us in Congress could prevent this annual "crisis" type of hearing from occurring. We should begin to legislate so that these child nutrition programs can meet their costs each year in a nondisruptive manner. It is difficult for schools to plan their nutrition programs—under the present system—when they cannot be sure, year to year, how much money will be made available to them. We could make their job and ours easier by providing funds according to their needs as seen over a long-range period.

Again, I extend my appreciation for the opportunity to present this testimony.

George McGovern.

---

[1] *See* Federal Food Programs: Part 1—Vending Machine Competition With National School Lunch Program; hearing of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, Apr. 17, 1973.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Progress And Problems In Achieving Objectives Of School Lunch Program

B-178564

Food and Nutrition Service
Department of Agriculture

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 29, 1973

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-178564

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

We have reviewed the progress and problems in achieving the objectives of the school lunch program administered by the Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture.

We made our review pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Elmer B. Staats
Comptroller General
of the United States

Contents

Page

DIGEST 1

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 5
History of school lunch program 5
Responsibility for administration 7
Program funding 8

2 MAKING NUTRITIOUS LUNCHES AVAILABLE TO ALL SCHOOL CHILDREN 10
Schools choosing not to participate 11
Schools without food service buildings and equipment 12
Schools with inadequate facilities 14
Efforts to extend program to all schools 14
Conclusions 17
Recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture 18
Agency comments 18

3 PROVIDING FREE OR REDUCED-PRICE LUNCHES TO ALL NEEDY SCHOOL CHILDREN 21
Reasons cited by those who did not want to participate 22
Administrative practices affecting needy students' participation 24
OIG review of implementation of free- and reduced-price-lunch program 26
Conclusions 29
Agency comments 29

4 NEED TO OBTAIN BETTER INFORMATION ON COST PER LUNCH 31
Recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture 32
Agency comments 33

5 SCOPE OF REVIEW 34

APPENDIX Page

I State educational agencies, school districts, and schools visited during review 35

II Federal assistance to States for child-feeding programs 37

III Letter dated January 19, 1973, from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, to the General Accounting Office 38

IV Principal officials of the Department of Agriculture responsible for administration of activities discussed in this report 41

ABBREVIATIONS

FNS	Food and Nutrition Service
GAO	General Accounting Office
OIG	Office of the Inspector General

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS
IN ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES
OF SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM
Food and Nutrition Service
Department of Agriculture B-178564

DIGEST

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

The Food and Nutrition Service administers four child-feeding programs and three related programs to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children.

Federal assistance to the States to carry out these programs has increased over the years. From fiscal year 1967 to fiscal year 1973, for example, the assistance increased from $438 million to an estimated $1.5 billion.

GAO reviewed the administration of the school lunch program, the largest of the child-feeding programs, to determine whether its objectives--making nutritious lunches available to all school children and providing them free or at reduced prices to needy children--were being achieved effectively.

The review included visits to 13 school districts and 46 schools in these districts in California, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, and Texas. (See app. I.)

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Making nutritious lunches available to all school children

The Service's statistics showed that, between fiscal years 1969 and 1972, the number of schools participating in the program increased from about 74,900, with about 40 million students enrolled, to about 82,900, with about 45 million students enrolled. Some of these schools were operating only limited programs because of inadequate facilities.

Service data indicated that, early in the 1971-72 school year, about 24,900 eligible schools, with about 8.7 million students enrolled, were not participating in the program. About 18,100 of these schools did not have any type of food service, and the Service identified at least 4,400, with 1.4 million students enrolled, as needy schools. (See p. 10.)

Some schools did not participate because

--their officials were not interested in participating,

--their officials preferred to operate their own lunch programs, or

--local conditions were such that they did not want to participate. (See p. 11.)

Some schools did not participate because they did not have the buildings and equipment necessary for preparing and serving food. Some of these schools said they lacked local funds to acquire the necessary

Tear Sheet. Upon removal, the report cover date should be noted hereon.

buildings and to purchase equipment. (See p. 12.)

Some participating schools had inadequate facilities and therefore could not serve lunches to all of their students. (See p. 14.)

State agencies were not effective in extending the program to all schools within their States, particularly to schools that required Federal assistance for necessary buildings and equipment. The Department's Office of the Inspector General reported that the Service's regional offices had made only limited efforts to extend the program to private schools. (See p. 14.)

The Service did not have reliable data on the schools needing assistance and on the extent of their needs. (See p. 16.)

Some of the reasons the schools cited for not participating were based on local preference or on special local conditions not susceptible to Federal persuasion. Other reasons, however, such as the lack of interest and the lack of facilities for preparing and serving food, evidenced problems which could be resolved.

To resolve these problems, the Service needs better data on the number of schools not participating and their reasons.

Such data would help the Service determine what assistance or changes in administrative policies or legislation may be needed to enable such schools to participate. (See p. 17.)

Providing free or reduced-price lunches to all needy students

After the May 1970 enactment of legislation which clarified responsibilities for providing free or reduced-price lunches, the number of students eating such lunches increased from about 5 million to 8.1 million in April 1972, a 60-percent increase.

The Service's March 1972 survey, however, showed that about 1.5 million needy students attending participating schools still were not eating free or reduced-price lunches. To determine why, GAO identified 183 needy students at 20 schools visited during the 1971-72 school year who were not eating free or reduced-price lunches and interviewed them or members of their families.

Of those interviewed, 75 said that they did not want to participate or to have the students participate because of personal reasons, such as pride or student preference not to eat the school lunches.

The other 108 persons interviewed said they wanted to eat, or to have the students eat, the school lunches free or at reduced prices. They gave various reasons for not participating, some of which appeared to be related to the schools' administrative practices which did not comply with the Service's regulations: some schools failed to send application forms to all families having children enrolled and used procedures which resulted in needy students' being identified. (See p. 21.)

The Office of the Inspector General found similar practices in its review of the administration of the free- and reduced-price-lunch program in other schools during the 1971-72 school year. It made several recommendations to the Service, including ones on the need for

--followup by the Service's regional office and State agency personnel on the schools' implementation of free- and reduced-price-lunch policies,

--prompt corrective action on problem areas,

--continued efforts to publicize the availability of free and reduced-price lunches, and

--renewed efforts to have schools develop systems that adequately protect the anonymity of students approved for free and reduced-price meals.

The Service said that action had been or would be taken on these matters. (See p. 26.)

GAO concurs with the Office of the Inspector General's recommendations to the Service and, in view of the actions that the Service has taken or planned, is not making any recommendations on this aspect of the program. (See p. 29.)

Need to obtain better information on cost per lunch

The Service lacked accurate information on the cost of lunches served under the program. It needs this information to insure that its reimbursements to the States are no greater than the allowable costs but are sufficient to give States an incentive to bring more needy students into the program.

The Service had not sufficiently guided the schools on how to compute the per-lunch cost because it had not identified what cost elements should be included. (See p. 31.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Secretary of Agriculture should have the Administrator of the Service:

--Make the studies necessary to obtain accurate information on the number and needs of schools that are not participating in the program and, if it is decided that the schools should be participating, determine whether changes in existing administrative policies or practices or in legislation are necessary.

--Direct the Service's regional offices to work more closely with the States in contacting nonparticipating schools and, where applicable, to contact nonparticipating schools directly, to convince them of the importance of providing nutritious meals to their students and to advise them of the types of assistance available to them under the school lunch program. Such promotional efforts could be especially effective in encouraging the participation of those schools whose reasons for not participating may be other than the unavailability of local funds. (See p. 18.)

--Specifically define the types of costs incurred by participating schools that are allowable for reimbursement by the Service. (See p. 32.)

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The Department generally agreed with GAO's conclusions and recommendations and described actions that were being taken to obtain better information, promote the program, and define reimbursable costs. (See pp. 18, 29, and 33 and app. III.)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

Progress has been made toward achieving the school lunch program's objectives; further actions by the Department could result in greater progress. Some existing conditions, however, make it uncertain whether the objectives will be fully achieved. The Congress should find this report useful in its continuing evaluation of the school lunch program.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), Department of Agriculture, administers four child-feeding programs and three related programs which the Congress authorized to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children by providing various forms of assistance to the States to carry out nonprofit child-feeding programs.

The child-feeding programs are (1) the National School Lunch Program, which includes general cash-for-food assistance for all lunches and special cash assistance for free or reduced-price lunches for needy students, (2) the School Breakfast Program, (3) the Special Milk Program, and (4) the Special Food Service Program for children in nonprofit service institutions, such as day-care centers, settlement houses, and recreation centers.

The related programs are (1) the Nonfood (equipment) Assistance Program, (2) the program to provide cash advances to State educational agencies for their administrative expenses in conducting child-feeding programs and in assisting local school districts and service institutions in their efforts to reach more children, and (3) the program for nutritional training and education for workers, cooperators, and participants in the child-feeding programs and for surveys and studies of requirements for such programs.

We reviewed the administration of the school lunch program, the largest of the child-feeding programs, to determine whether its objectives--making nutritious lunches available to all school children and providing free or reduced-price lunches to needy children--were being effectively achieved. We made our review in 6 States, 13 school districts, and 46 schools in these districts. (See app. I.)

HISTORY OF SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Although Federal assistance for school lunch operations began as early as 1933, the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (42 U.S.C. 1751), provided the first permanent legislation authorizing Federal assistance for a school lunch program. Specifically, the Congress declared that the objectives of the act were "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food ***."

The act authorized assistance to States in the form of cash reimbursements for part of the food costs and authorized continuance of direct distribution of suitable foods acquired by the Department through the use of customs receipts as authorized by section 32 of Public Law 74-320 (7 U.S.C. 612c). In addition, the act authorized the Department to purchase and distribute certain foods which would improve the nutritional quality of the lunches served. The act listed the following three basic operating standards.

--Lunches served should meet nutritional standards established by the Department.

--The lunch program should be operated on a nonprofit basis.

--Children unable to pay the full price should be served free or reduced-price lunches.

The Department's food distribution authority was further expanded by section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431) which authorized donations of food acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under price-support programs.

On October 15, 1962, Public Law 87-823 added section 11, Special Assistance, to the National School Lunch Act. This section authorized higher rates of cash reimbursement to needy schools (those drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist), to assist these schools in serving lunches to students unable to pay the full cost of such lunches. Continuous funding under section 11, which began in fiscal year 1966, increased from about $1[illegible] million in that fiscal year to about $502 million in fiscal year 1972 and is estimated at about $620 million for fiscal year 1973.

The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771) extended, expanded, and strengthened the efforts of the school lunch program including the establishment of a permanent program of nonfood assistance. This program provides up to 75 percent of the cost of equipment purchased or rented by schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist, to enable such schools to establish, maintain, and expand school food service programs.

Public Law 91-248, approved May 14, 1970 (84 Stat. 207), clarified responsibilities for providing free and reduced-price meals. The law directed that such meals be provided on the basis of income guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The law emphasized that the States were to extend the school lunch program to all schools and that free or reduced-price lunches were to be made available to all needy students. The law also permitted transferring Federal funds between programs, provided for advance appropriations and carryover authorization, strengthened the nutritional training and educational benefits of the programs, and required each State to develop a plan of child nutrition operations by January 1 of each year for the following fiscal year.

Public Law 92-153, approved November 5, 1971 (85 Stat. 419), increased the amount of reimbursement for lunches served. An average reimbursement rate of 6 cents in general cash-for-food assistance was established for each meal served and 40 cents in additional special assistance was guaranteed for each free meal unless the cost of providing such a meal was less than 46 cents.

Public Law 92-433, approved September 26, 1972 (86 Stat. 724), increased the reimbursement rate for general cash-for-food assistance to 8 cents for each meal served. The act also required that 50 percent of nonfood assistance funds be used solely for schools without food service and permitted the 25-percent matching requirement to be waived for schools without food service that are determined by the State to be especially needy.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATION

The Department of Agriculture, through the FNS headquarters and regional offices (1) supervises States' administration of the program, (2) administers the program for private schools in those States where the State educational agencies are prohibited from disbursing funds to private schools, (3) distributes commodities to the States and private schools where applicable, (4) reviews State and local school operations, (5) apportions funds to the States, and (6) sets standards for nutritious meals.

At the State level, the State educational agency administers the program in public schools and in private schools where permitted. The agency (1) submits a State plan of child nutrition operations for each fiscal year for FNS approval, (2) establishes a system of accounting under which school food authorities will report program information, (3) maintains current records on schools' operations and accounts for program funds, (4) determines whether the matching requirements of the act are being met, (5) provides supervisory assistance to local schools, (6) provides the schools with monthly information on foods determined by the Department of Agriculture to be in plentiful supply, and (7) investigates complaints.

FNS and the States are responsible for extending the program to all schools. In addition, the States are responsible for assisting local schools to reach additional students.

At the local level, the schools or school districts carry out the program and determine the students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches in accordance with policy statements which must be submitted to the State agencies. To participate in the program, each school and school district must enter into a written agreement with the State and must keep accurate records to support claims for reimbursements.

PROGRAM FUNDING

As shown in detail in appendix II, Federal assistance to the States for the school lunch program and for the other FNS-administered child-feeding and related programs increased from about $438 million in fiscal year 1967 to about $1.5 billion in fiscal year 1973.

For the school lunch program, States must match the Federal grants for general cash-for-food assistance from sources within the State at a ratio of 3 to 1. For States with below-average per capita incomes, this ratio may be decreased. Between fiscal years 1967 and 1972, annual contributions from sources within the States increased from $1.33 billion to $1.66 billion, most of which came from students' payments. FNS estimated that, for fiscal year 1973, these contributions would total $1.76 billion.

CHAPTER 2

MAKING NUTRITIOUS LUNCHES AVAILABLE TO ALL SCHOOL CHILDREN

FNS statistics show that participation in the school lunch program by both schools and students has increased in recent years. About 74,900 schools, with about 40 million students enrolled, participated in the program in fiscal year 1969 compared with about 82,900 schools, with about 45 million students enrolled, in fiscal year 1972. Some of the schools, however, had only limited programs because of inadequate facilities.

FNS statistics indicated that, between fiscal years 1969 and 1972, the average number of students participating in the program each day had increased from 20.7 million to 24.4 million and that the average number of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches each day had increased from 3.1 million to 7.9 million.

FNS estimated that in fiscal year 1973 the program would operate in about 84,600 schools, with about 46 million students enrolled, and that an average 27.5 million students would participate in the program each day with 8.4 million receiving lunches free or at reduced prices.

FNS statistics as of October 1971--early in the 1971-72 school year--indicated that about 24,900 eligible schools, with about 8.7 million students enrolled, were not participating in the school lunch program, including about 18,100 eligible schools, with about 5.5 million students enrolled, that did not have any type of food service.[1]

FNS identified as needy schools at least 4,400 of the 24,900 schools which were not participating in the school lunch program. These 4,400 schools had an enrollment of about 1.4 million.

---

[1] FNS statistics as of September 30, 1972, indicated that about 23,900 eligible schools, with an enrollment of about 8.3 million, were not participating in the school lunch program, including about 17,700 eligible schools, with an enrollment of about 5 million, that did not have any type of food service.

To determine why schools were not participating in the school lunch program, we either sent questionnaires to or interviewed local and State school officials in four States. These officials represented most of the nonparticipating public and private schools in the four States. In a fifth State, we reviewed the responses to questionnaires sent by the State during the 1971-72 school year to its nonparticipating public and private schools. In all six States included in our review, we also discussed with State and local school district officials the reasons for their schools' nonparticipation or limited participation.

The information we obtained showed that:

--Some schools chose not to participate because (1) their officials were not interested in participating, (2) their officals preferred to operate their own lunch programs, or (3) local conditions were such that they did not want to participate.

--Some schools did not participate because they did not have the buildings and equipment necessary for preparing and serving food. Some of these schools said they lacked the local funds needed to acquire such buildings and equipment.

--Some schools were participating in the program but had only limited facilities and could not serve lunches to all of their students.

Also, the State agencies and the FNS regional offices were not effective in carrying out their responsibilities for extending the program to nonparticipating schools, especially to private schools.

SCHOOLS CHOOSING NOT TO PARTICIPATE

The information we gathered indicated that some schools simply were not interested in participating. Some of the schools choosing not to participate served meals to students under their own programs. School officials indicated that they were not interested in participating in the Federal school lunch program due to its basic requirements that

(1) lunches contain the basic components--meat or other protein-type food as a main dish, vegetables or fruits, bread or a similar product, butter or margarine, and milk--required by the Secretary of Agriculture's guidelines, (2) free or reduced-price lunches be provided to needy students, and (3) the program operate on a nonprofit basis.

In one State, officials of 32 schools stated that they chose not to participate in the program rather than serve the required lunches or operate nonprofit programs. In another State, officials of three schools said that they did not want to go to the administrative expense of operating free- or reduced-price-lunch programs.

Officials of other schools, some of which had no food-serving facilities, said that they did not want to participate or to acquire facilities due to special local conditions Some of the conditions were:

--The school district and/or school was too small for a lunch program to be operated economically.

--The school was scheduled to be closed in the near future or had inadequate facilities and equipment with which to conduct a food service program.

--Students lived close to the school and could go home for lunch.

--A court order was pending to consolidate districts because of small enrollments or racial imbalances.

--The school required special food preparation for religious reasons.

--The school did not accept public funds.

SCHOOLS WITHOUT FOOD SERVICE BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT

In replying to the questionnaires, needy and nonneedy nonparticipating schools in the five States said that they did not have buildings and equipment for preparing and serving food. Although some schools indicated that they had local funds to acquire the necessary buildings and to purchase equipment, many other schools reported that they did not have the needed local funds.

Under the nonfood assistance program, Federal funds are available to reimburse needy schools for up to 75 percent of the cost of equipment purchased or rented to establish, maintain, and expand school food service programs. However, nonfood assistance is not authorized for acquiring new buildings or for expanding existing buildings nor is it authorized for nonneedy schools. Public Law 92-433 permits the 25-percent matching requirement to be waived for schools without food service that are determined by a State to be especially needy.

In one State, responses from 152 public and private nonparticipating schools indicated that 93 schools were not participating because they did not have the necessary buildings and equipment. Of these 93 schools, 90 stated that they did not have the needed local funds. Another 36 of the 152 schools responded that they had sufficient local funds and were planning to participate within the next 1 to 3 years. The remaining 23 schools cited various other reasons for their nonparticipation.

The local funds problem confronting some schools is illustrated by the information obtained from 68 of the 90 schools not participating because they did not have the needed local funds. The total funds required for buildings and equipment for these 68 schools, representing 8 public school districts and 2 private schools, was estimated by the schools or school districts at $2.5 million. At least 50 percent of that amount was for buildings and would have to be paid entirely with local funds. Furthermore, the low percentage of needy students reported by about 65 percent of the schools indicated that the schools might not be eligible for the 75-percent Federal assistance for purchasing equipment, in which case the schools would have to pay the entire cost of the equipment.

In another State, responses from school districts representing 824 nonparticipating schools disclosed that 354 were not participating because they lacked the necessary buildings and equipment. Of these 354 schools, 198 stated that they did not have the needed local funds.

SCHOOLS WITH INADEQUATE FACILITIES

In three States, inadequate facilities in some participating schools resulted in the schools' limiting the number of students who could participate in the school lunch program. These quotas prevented both nonneedy and needy students from participating in the program.

In one State, a school district with 48 schools allowed only the students who were bused to school to participate because facilities were not adequate to feed all the students. About 2,800 of the total school district enrollment of about 15,900 were bused, including 2,150 of the total 3,150 students who were considered needy. Therefore about 13,100 students, including about 1,000 who were considered needy, had been excluded from participating.

In one school district in another State, a school provided lunches for its own students and for students of six needy schools. Although the kitchen capacity at the school preparing the lunches had been expanded by about 50 percent, its limited capacity restricted participation at the six other schools. At four of the schools, only the needy students were provided with lunches. At the two other schools, not all the needy students were provided with lunches.

The principal of the school preparing the lunches told us that, if student participation at his school increased, he would have to further reduce the number of lunches sent to the six other schools.

EFFORTS TO EXTEND PROGRAM TO ALL SCHOOLS

The State plan for child nutrition operations, which each State agency must submit annually to FNS, is to include a description of the manner in which the State proposes to extend the school lunch program to every school in the State. Where a State is prohibited from administering aid programs to private schools, the responsibility for extending the program to the private schools rests with the FNS regional office.

The nonparticipating schools toward which such efforts are to be directed are referred to by FNS as "no program" schools and include both (1) schools which conduct their own lunch programs and (2) schools which do not have the buildings and equipment for preparing and serving lunches and which generally require nonfood assistance to enable them to participate in the program.

Our review disclosed that State agencies were not effective in extending the program to all schools in their States, particularly to schools requiring nonfood assistance for the necessary buildings and equipment. For example, one State agency had approved requests for nonfood assistance on a first-come-first-served basis without identifying the relative needs of individual schools. Another State agency had not surveyed its schools to identify those needing nonfood assistance and to inform them about the availability of such assistance.

Also the Department's Office of the Inspector General (OIG), which reviewed FNS regional office operations between May 1971 and March 1972, reported that some FNS regional offices had made only limited efforts to extend the school lunch program to private schools. OIG reported that the fiscal year 1972 plan of one regional office, which called for actively recruiting nonparticipating private schools and taking a poll of such schools to determine whether they had food service, had not been carried out as of December 1971. OIG had found that the regional office had primarily followed up on inquiries initiated by interested private schools. Regional office officials told OIG that they had been unable to carry out that phase of the plan because of more pressing problems and their increased workloads.

In another regional office OIG noted inconsistent past efforts to extend the school lunch program. OIG found that, of 416 nonparticipating private schools in a 3-State area in that region, 268 had not been visited by the regional office. OIG noted that the regional office had sent a memorandum explaining the program to some of those schools in March 1971 but that the office had not recorded the schools contacted or the results achieved. OIG reported that, of the 148 schools the regional office visited, 107 were visited before fiscal year 1970 (there were no records of visits in fiscal year 1970) and only 41 were visited in fiscal year 1971.

OIG recommended that both regional offices initiate plans of action outlining steps to be taken to offer the program to all eligible private schools. FNS officials subsequently advised us that all five FNS regional offices had adopted formal outreach action plans.

To effectively extend the program to all schools, FNS and the States need accurate data on the schools which need assistance and the extent of their needs. To identify schools without food service, FNS conducted several surveys and sent questionnaires to the States. The State agencies were to collect and summarize the data and forward it to FNS. However, the agencies did not accurately prepare the questionnaires and only roughly estimated the number of schools without food service.

For example, the FNS survey, which showed that about 18,500 schools did not have food service as of October 1971, did not disclose whether such schools lacked the facilities for preparing and serving food. Moreover, our test of the accuracy of four States' data indicated that the reported number of schools without food service was not reliable. In some States, the State educational agencies did not have sufficient information available to prepare accurate surveys. In one State, all schools not participating in the school lunch program were assumed to be without food service. In another State, a certain percentage of the nonparticipating schools was assumed to be without food service.

Our discussions with State officials indicated that efforts to identify the needs of nonparticipating schools and to extend the program to these schools had been hampered by several factors. These officials stated that the shortage of administrative staff in relation to the increased scope of child-feeding programs had affected their efforts to extend the program. They also cited their difficulty in obtaining information from nonparticipating schools. One State official stated that, due to the uncertainty of funding in past years, promotional efforts had been limited to large school districts and to schools which had expressed specific interest in the program.

- - - -

FNS officials generally concurred with our observations. They stated that the Department was aware of the need to bring no-program schools into the program and that FNS had several efforts to deal with this problem underway. They referred specifically to the report on no-program schools issued by the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition in January 1972. This report recommended, among other things, that the Department concentrate on extending the program so that all schools needing lunch programs would be participating within 3 years. FNS officials said that they concurred in this recommendation and that their goal was to bring 5,000 no-program schools into the program during the 1972-73 school year.

Regarding schools which did not participate due to the lack of facilities, FNS officials expressed the view that sufficient Federal resources were available to schools which really wanted lunch programs. They said that in many cases the lack of facilities could be overcome by alternative feeding methods, such as catered lunches prepared by other schools or by commercial outlets. They also stated that the program was sufficiently flexible to permit participation by schools requiring special food preparation.

FNS officials pointed out that, since enactment of Public Law 91-248, State agencies and FNS had concerned themselves with implementing the free- and reduced-price-lunch policy at schools already in the program and that therefore their efforts to extend the program to all schools had been limited. FNS officials also stated that, although the scope of child nutrition programs had increased tremendously in the past several years, administrative staffs at the State agencies and at the FNS regional offices had remained relatively small.

CONCLUSIONS

The schools that did not offer their students any lunch programs had a number of reasons for this situation. Although some of the reasons were based on local preference or on special local conditions not susceptible to Federal persuasion, other reasons cited, such as the lack of interest or the lack of facilities for preparing and serving food, evidenced problems that could be resolved. To resolve these problems, FNS needs better data on the number of schools not participating in the program and their reasons. Such data would help FNS to determine what assistance or changes in administrative policies or legislation may be needed to enable the schools to participate.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

We recommend that, to help achieve the objective of making nutritious lunches available to all school children, the Administrator, FNS:

--Make the studies necessary to obtain accurate information on the number and needs of schools not participating in the program and, if it is decided that the schools should be participating, determine whether changes in existing administrative policies or practices or in legislation are necessary.

--Direct the FNS regional offices to work more closely with the States in contacting nonparticipating schools and, where applicable, to contact nonparticipating schools directly, to convince them of the importance of providing nutritious meals to their students and to advise them of the types of assistance available under the school lunch program. Such promotional efforts could be especially effective in encouraging the participation of those schools whose reasons for not participating may be other than the lack of local funds.

AGENCY COMMENTS

The Department advised us by letter dated January 19, 1973 (see app. III), that it generally agreed with our conclusions and recommendations and found them to be consistent with its experience in administering the program.

The Department said that:

--FNS was annually updating inventory data on no-program schools.

--FNS personnel were developing the methodology and reporting forms to be used in the survey on unmet needs for equipment in schools eligible for assistance. The results of the survey would be reported to the Congress, as required by section 6(e) of Public Law 92-433.

--Although committed to reaching schools which offer no food services and those which provide food services but which do not participate in the Federal program, FNS's primary efforts were being directed toward the first type.

--A nationwide drive involving State, regional, and Washington personnel had begun in August 1972; the five FNS regions had adopted formal outreach plans; and FNS and State personnel were holding meetings and workshops and initiating mass mailings to the nonparticipating school officials, in line with the commitment to bring 5,000 additional schools into the program in the 1972-73 school year and to reach as many schools as possible within 3 years.

--Concentrated efforts were being emphasized in 11 States where the numbers of schools and students without food services in public and private schools were particularly high. Top priority had been assigned to establishing programs in title I schools.[1]

--In some cases FNS regional personnel were directly conducting the outreach effort to assist State agencies that did not have sufficient personnel.

--Each regional administrator submitted a detailed monthly report showing the status of new programs established and schools' reasons for refusing to participate.

--As schools having no facilities for preparing and serving food were identified, they were being provided with a brochure illustrating alternative methods of providing adequate school lunches.

---

[1] Title I schools are schools receiving funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 241a) which authorizes Federal financial assistance for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children living in areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families.

We believe the actions that FNS has taken or planned should help it more fully achieve the program objective of making nutritious lunches available to all school children.

CHAPTER 3

PROVIDING FREE OR REDUCED-PRICE LUNCHES

TO ALL NEEDY SCHOOL CHILDREN

In recent years the number of students eating free or reduced-price lunches has increased significantly. In April 1970, before the passage of Public Law 91-248 which clarified responsibilities for providing such lunches, about 5 million students, nationwide, were eating free or reduced-price lunches.

FNS statistics showed that as of April 1972 the number had increased to about 8.1 million students, about a 60-percent increase in 2 years. However, an FNS survey as of March 1972 disclosed that about 9.6 million needy students were attending participating schools. Therefore about 1.5 million still were not eating free or reduced-price lunches.

To determine why, we identified 183 needy students at 20 of the 26 schools we visited during the 1971-72 school year who were not eating free or reduced-price lunches and interviewed them or members of their families. The average daily attendance in the 20 schools was about 21,000 students, of whom about 5,300 were eating free or reduced-price lunches. We were unable to determine the percent of needy students eating lunches free or at reduced prices because valid information on the total number of needy students in these schools was not available.

Of those 183 persons interviewed, 75 stated that they did not want to participate, or that they did not want the students to participate, for personal reasons, such as pride and student preference not to eat the school lunches.

The other 108 persons interviewed stated that they wanted to eat, or wanted the students to eat, the school lunches free or at reduced prices, but that, for various reasons, they were not participating.

We found that certain administrative practices at some of the schools we visited during the 1971-72 school year did not comply with FNS regulations. OIG found similar practices in its review of the administration of the free- and reduced-price-lunch policies in other schools during the 1971-72 school year.

The reasons cited by those who did not want to participate and the administrative practices which affected participation by needy students are discussed below.

REASONS CITED BY THOSE WHO DID NOT WANT TO PARTICIPATE

Our interviews with the 75 persons who did not want to participate in the school lunch program or who did not want the students to participate indicated that their reasons generally were personal. Most of the reasons could be classified into two categories: (1) parent or student pride and (2) student preference not to eat, or student dislike of, the school lunches. Other reasons included:

--The parent preferred the student to eat lunch at home because the parent could prepare a better lunch.

--The student lived close to the school and could go home for lunch.

--The student was on a diet.

--The student needed special food for health reasons.

--The student could not eat certain foods because of religious belief.

Some persons we interviewed said that the students preferred the a la carte service available to them. With a la carte service, a student can select a lunch from a variety of food items rather than be served a lunch meeting the Secretary's guidelines, commonly known as a type A lunch. A number of nonneedy students also cited this preference as their reason for not participating in the school lunch program.

The following example shows the significance of this preference.

--In a needy secondary school, which had converted its lunch program from a la carte service to a type A lunch during the 1970-71 school year, general participation fell from an average 850 students daily during the 1968-69 school year to about 630 students daily in December 1971. The principal of this school told us that he considered this drop in participation remarkable because, under a la carte service, no free or reduced-price lunches had been served and that about 75 percent of the students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunches under the type A lunch program. He said that, when the type A lunches were served, students had no choice of what they could eat and lost interest in the lunches.

ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AFFECTING NEEDY STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION

At 15 of the 20 schools where we held our interviews during the 1971-72 school year, certain administrative practices did not comply with FNS regulations for free and reduced-price lunches. At seven of these schools, these practices appeared to be related to some of the reasons cited for nonparticipation by those interviewed. We found similar practices at six other schools which we visited during the 1971-72 school year but at which we did not interview students or members of their families.

The regulations require that:

--A notice be distributed to all parents of children attending schools participating in the school lunch program to advise them about the free- and reduced-price-lunch program. This notice is to be accompanied by an application form for free or reduced-price lunches. If eligibility standards change during the school year, the same notification procedures are to be followed.

--The food authorities of schools participating in the lunch program insure that students receiving free or reduced-price lunches are not overtly identified by the use of special tokens or tickets or by any other means.

Required application forms for free and reduced-price lunches not sent

Of the 26 schools we visited during the 1971-72 school year, 8(1) had not sent application forms for free or reduced-price lunches at the beginning of the school year to

---

[1] The eight schools not sending application forms at the beginning of the school year were Mayfair Elementary, Irwin Junior High, and Theodore Roosevelt High in Fresno, California; Peter H. Burnett Junior High and San Jose High in San Jose, California; Douglass Elementary in Kansas City, Kansas; and Harris Elementary and Northeastern High in Detroit, Michigan.

students' families and 7,(1) including 2 of the 8, had not sent application forms after eligibility standards changed during the school year. In one school district a school sent notices to the families about the school lunch program but, contrary to FNS regulations and the school district's approved free- and reduced-price-lunch policy, did not include application forms. Some parents told us that they could not, or would not, go to the school to complete the applications. As a result, their children were not eating the free or reduced-price lunches.

Officials of this school district told us that the application forms had not been sent to the families because the officials considered it a waste of money to send forms to every home in the district. School officials in another district told us that they had not distributed applications to everyone because the district had not provided enough forms.

In commenting on the practice of not sending application forms to all families, district officials stated that corrective action had been or would be taken.

Identity of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches not protected

In 20(2) of the 26 schools we visited during the 1971-72 school year, procedures used to account for the

---

[1] The seven schools not sending application forms after eligibility standards changed were Fitzgerald Elementary, Harris Elementary, Moore Elementary, Scripps Elementary, Condon Junior High, Spain Junior High, and Northeastern High in Detroit.

[2] The 20 schools were Irwin Junior High and Theodore Roosevelt High in Fresno; Washington Elementary, Peter H. Burnett Junior High, and San Jose High in San Jose; Douglass Elementary in Kansas City; Horace Mann Elementary and East High in Wichita, Kansas; Fitzgerald Elementary, Harris Elementary, Moore Elementary, Preston Elementary, Scripps Elementary, Condon Junior High, Spain Junior High, and Northeastern High in Detroit; Kelly Elementary, Poe Junior High, and Rhodes Junior High in San Antonio, Texas; and Lincoln Street Elementary in Texarkana, Texas.

number of free and reduced-price lunches served resulted in the overt identification of needy students. We were told in 14 interviews that students did not want to take the school lunches free or at reduced prices because of their reluctance to be identified as needy. Some of the procedures were:

--Nonneedy students paid in the lunchroom, but needy students were recognized and not charged by the cashier, used lunch tickets, or called out assigned numbers as they passed through the lunch lines.

--Nonneedy students paid at the teacher's desk, while needy students remained seated.

Local school and school district officials commented on the difficulty of protecting the anonymity of needy students. Some officials expressed a reluctance to devise a more sophisticated system to protect anonymity because of the time and expense involved. They also said that students discussed this matter among themselves and therefore knew who were receiving free lunches.

The school districts advised us, however, that efforts had been or were being made to develop procedures that protect the anonymity of needy students.

OIG REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF FREE- AND REDUCED-PRICE-LUNCH PROGRAM

OIG issued a report in May 1972 on its review of the manner in which the free- and reduced-price-lunch program had been implemented during the 1971-72 school year by 5 FNS regional offices and by educational agencies and school districts in 13 States and the District of Columbia. OIG's report recognized the increase in the number of needy children benefiting from the school lunch program but noted that administrative weaknesses still existed that would impede further progress. OIG reported the following as the more significant weaknesses in the implementation of the free- and reduced-price-lunch program.

--School district officials did not always comply with all the procedures agreed to in their approved free- and reduced-price-lunch policy statements.

--In many instances, publicity and literature on free lunches were not promptly distributed to local news media, applications for free lunches were not promptly disseminated to parents, and approvals of free-lunch requests were not promptly processed by school officials.

--The anonymity of students approved for free and reduced-price lunches was not protected in 50, or about 40 percent, of the 132 school districts audited. Some needy students had to work for their meals; some were required to use a medium of exchange, such as a voucher, which differed from that used by paying students; and some had to use identification cards which clearly indicated their status as free-lunch recipients.

--Because trained personnel were lacking and because other responsibilities were emphasized, FNS regional office and State agency administrative analyses and reviews of State agency and school operations, respectively, were not of sufficient depth or scope to determine the extent of, or reason for, significant program shortcomings.

--FNS estimates of the number of needy students were largely based on unsupported data submitted by State agencies.

OIG recommended, among other things, that the Administrator, FNS:

--Reemphasize to FNS regional office and State agency personnel their specific areas of responsibility under the program, including the necessary followup on implementation of policy statements and prompt corrective action on problem areas.

--Strongly encourage schools to continue to publicize the availability of free and reduced-price lunches. Effective followup should be required, especially in those schools where participation is below the estimated potential need.

- --Reemphasize that FNS regional office and State agency reviewers need to concentrate on covering schools' implementation of, and success in complying with, free- and reduced-price-lunch policies.

- --Assist the FNS regional offices, State agencies, and school officials to obtain sound statistics of each school's need to provide free and reduced-price lunches within its geographic area.

- --Renew efforts to have schools develop systems that adequately protect the anonymity of students approved for free and reduced-price lunches. Acceptable methods should be publicized and followup should be effected to insure proper implementation.

The FNS Administrator advised OIG by letted dated August 10, 1972, that FNS generally agreed with OIG's findings and recommendations. He stated that the FNS regional offices and State agencies had been advised of the deficiencies noted by OIG and of the action to be taken to correct them. He stated also that he intended to provide the necessary vigorous followup on the proposed corrections to insure improved performance at all levels in line with the purposes of, and regulations for, child-feeding programs.

- - - -

FNS officials generally agreed with our observations and commented that:

- --The information we obtained during our interviews was very interesting and worthwhile because this was the first effort they were aware of to obtain information and views on the program from prospective recipients.

- --There was sufficient program flexibility to permit substitution of foods if students did not like the food served.

- --A distinction should be made between overtly identifying needy students and protecting their anonymity.

Since FNS and the schools could never completely protect the anonymity of needy students, their main concern was to satisfy themselves that the procedures used by the schools did not result in overt identification. Their role was to identify collection procedures used by schools that were successful in protecting the anonymity of needy students and to disseminate this information to the States and other schools.

CONCLUSIONS

Although free or reduced-price lunches have been made available to an increasing number of needy students, our findings, together with OIG's findings, have shown several obstacles to accomplishing the objective of reaching all needy school children. The principal obstacles are:

--Schools' adoption of practices in administering the free- and reduced-price-lunch policy that do not comply with FNS regulations.

--Needy families' refusal to have their children accept the school lunches free or at reduced prices.

--The inadequate coverage by FNS regional office and State agency reviewers of the schools' implementation of, and success in complying with, free- and reduced-price-lunch policies.

We believe that OIG's recommendations to FNS for improving the implementation of free- and reduced-price-lunch policies and the actions taken or planned by FNS should help overcome the obstacles discussed above; therefore we are not making any recommendations on this aspect of the program.

AGENCY COMMENTS

In its comments the Department stated that the increase in the number of free and reduced-price lunches served since the May 1970 law changed the requirements for such lunches was due to FNS's determined efforts and to the cooperation of State agency and local school personnel. The Department pointed out that these efforts had been somewhat hampered and at times delayed because of the timing of legislative amendments and regulatory changes; however, the income guidelines for the 1972-73 school year were published in May 1972 and guidance on updating and implementing the free- and reduced-price-lunch policies was issued in mid-June to permit all schools to have approved policy statements at the beginning of the school year.

The Department further stated that FNS was continuing to direct corrective action on the program deficiencies disclosed by OIG and by administrative reviews; that FNS had reviewed all the State agency policies and the local school policies approved by the State agencies; and that FNS had visited selected school districts and individual schools in all States to insure that the policies were implemented in line with FNS regulations and Federal law.

CHAPTER 4

NEED TO OBTAIN BETTER INFORMATION ON COST PER LUNCH

To more effectively administer the school lunch program, FNS needs accurate financial information on the program's operation. FNS especially lacked such information for the cost of lunches. An accurate per-lunch cost would help not only to insure that the Federal reimbursements do not exceed the actual costs of lunches, as is required by existing legislation, but also to determine the extent to which especially needy schools are eligible for higher reimbursements allowed by the legislation.

Before fiscal year 1971, the Federal reimbursement rate for free school lunches generally was considerably lower than the schools' cost of providing such lunches.

With the fiscal year 1972 increase in the reimbursement rate for free lunches to 46 cents each--a rate which more nearly approximated the cost of providing the lunches--FNS needed more precise information on each school's reimbursable costs if it was to effectively administer the Federal reimbursement requirements. FNS, however, did not provide sufficient guidance to the schools on how to determine and report their costs. Schools were required to include costs for food, labor, and "other" on their claims for reimbursement, but no criteria were provided to identify what cost elements should be included in these broad categories.

Schools computed their costs in a variety of ways. Some schools included only the direct costs of food, labor, and supplies; others also included indirect costs. Some schools charged the costs of all food, labor, and supplies to the lunch program, although some of the costs were applicable to, and should have been charged to, other programs, such as the breakfast, special milk, and a la carte lunch programs. One school district covered in our review had significantly overstated its costs because it had included certain costs which pertained to the prior year's school lunch program.

Lunch costs reported by individual schools varied widely. For example, an FNS study as of December 1971 showed that the average per-lunch cost at private schools covered in the study ranged from 18 cents to 95 cents. An FNS official told us that, because many of the schools incurred costs of less than 46 cents per lunch, FNS might be forced to seek refunds. These refunds could prove financially detrimental to many schools. For example, the study showed that 85 of 93 schools in one FNS region had a per-lunch cost of less than 46 cents, including 50 which had an average per-lunch cost of less than 35 cents.

The American School Food Service Association compiled costs reported by school food service directors in 41 States as of March 1972. These per-lunch costs ranged from 49 cents to 91 cents and averaged 63 cents.

FNS has taken steps to provide additional clarification and guidance as to what costs should be reimbursable. An accounting manual designed by a firm of certified public accountants under contract with FNS was tested in a number of school districts from September through December 1972. In December 1972 FNS completed a survey of direct and indirect operating costs applicable to the program in several States, to determine the average cost of school lunches. FNS analyzed 1971-72 school year lunch costs, to identify any instances where reimbursements exceeded costs.

These efforts did not significantly help schools compute per-lunch costs because FNS did not identify what costs were to be included in the computations. After we pointed out this lack, FNS officials informed us that they recognized the need to define allowable costs and that they were preparing a policy statement on the matter.

A specific definition of allowable costs would enable FNS to determine whether the reimbursement rate is no greater than allowable costs but is sufficient to provide the incentive for States and schools to bring more needy students into the program.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

We recommend that the Administrator, FNS, in developing the policy statement on per-lunch cost, specifically define the types of costs incurred by participating schools that are allowable for reimbursement.

AGENCY COMMENTS

In its comments the Department stated that the policy statement being developed would specifically define allowable reimbursement costs. The Department said that, although FNS had issued guidelines to its regional administrators for determining the cost of producing a type A lunch, the methods varied depending, in part, on the types of accounting systems used in the schools; many systems did not permit definitive determinations of the per-lunch cost of providing a type A lunch.

The Department further advised us that it anticipated that the new accounting handbook, which had been field tested, would uniformly define costs--both for accounting and for determining levels of Federal reimbursement.

CHAPTER 5

SCOPE OF REVIEW

We made our review at the Department of Agriculture headquarters in Washington, D.C.; at the State educational agencies in California, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, and Texas; and at 13 selected school districts and 46 schools within those districts. (See app. I.)

We reviewed the administration of the school lunch program in Indiana and Kentucky primarily during the 1970-71 school year and in California, Kansas, Michigan, and Texas during the 1971-72 school year. Our review in Michigan was made primarily in Detroit to cover the program in a large northern industrial urban area.

We reviewed the applicable legislation and the policies, procedures, and program records of the Department, the six State educational agencies, and the selected school districts and schools. We also interviewed Federal, State, and local officials and obtained written comments from some school district officials. We reviewed selected reports issued by OIG on its reviews of the program.

At 20 of the 26 schools we visited during the 1971-72 school year, we identified 183 needy students who were not participating and interviewed them or members of their families.

APPENDIX I

STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND SCHOOLS VISITED DURING REVIEW

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA:

Fresno City Unified School District:
- Irwin Junior High
- Mayfair Elementary
- Theodore Roosevelt High

San Jose Unified School District:
- Peter H. Burnett Junior High
- San Jose High
- Washington Elementary

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA:

Fort Wayne Community Schools:
- Hillcrest School
- Portage Junior High
- Francis M. Price School
- Willard Shambaugh School

Indianapolis Public Schools:
- School 27
- School 74
- School 83
- School 21

Richmond Community School Corporation:
- Boston School
- Hibberd Elementary and Junior High
- Highland School
- Test Junior High

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, TOPEKA, KANSAS:

Unified School District No. 500, Kansas City:
- Argentine High
- Douglass Elementary
- Northeast Junior High

APPENDIX I

Unified School District No. 259, Wichita:
- East High
- Horace Mann Junior High
- Jefferson Elementary

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY:

Louisville Independent School District:
- Elizabeth Breckinridge Elementary
- Cochran Elementary
- Parkland Junior High

Owensboro Independent School District:
- Estes Junior High
- Lincoln Elementary

Perry County School District:
- D.C. Combs Memorial High
- Leatherwood Consolidated
- M.C. Napier High

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, LANSING, MICHIGAN:

School District of the City of Detroit:
- Condon Junior High
- Fitzgerald Elementary
- Harris Elementary
- Moore Elementary
- Northeastern High
- Preston Elementary
- Scripps Elementary
- Spain Junior High

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY, AUSTIN, TEXAS:

San Antonio Independent School District:
- Kelly Field Elementary
- Poe Junior High
- Rhodes Junior High

Texarkana Independent School District:
- Lincoln Street Elementary
- Pine Street Junior High
- Texas High

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR CHILD-FEEDING PROGRAMS

Cash grants (note a)	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973 (note b)
	(millions)						
School lunches for all children	$147.7	$154.7	$161.2	$168.0	$225.8	$ 252.6	$ 340.0
Additional payments for free and reduced-price lunches	1.9	4.9	42.0	132.0	309.2	502.0	620.0
Special Milk Program	98.7	101.9	101.9	101.5	92.3	95.0	96.4
School breakfasts for needy children	.6	2.0	5.6	10.9	20.2	26.5	52.3
Nonfood assistance for needy schools (equipment)	.7	.7	10.2	16.7	37.1	17.8	16.1
State administrative expenses	-	-	.5	1.7	3.5	3.3	3.5
Nonschool food programs	-	-	3.2	7.3	21.0	42.6	74.0
Nutritional training and surveys	-	-	-	-	.7	.6	1.0
	249.6	264.2	324.6	438.1	709.8	940.4	1,203.3
Donated commodities (note c)							
Section 6	57.9	55.5	64.2	64.4	64.3	64.0	64.3
Section 32	51.0	100.1	100.5	133.3	127.8	112.4	86.5
Section 416	79.5	120.4	107.4	68.1	87.1	138.7	156.8
	188.4	276.0	272.1	265.8	279.2	315.1	307.6
	$438.0	$540.2	$596.7	$703.9	$989.0	$1,255.5	$1,510.9

[a] Represents obligations.

[b] Estimated.

[c] Represents estimated value of commodities distributed.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

January 19, 1973

Mr. Richard J. Woods
Assistant Director
Resources and Economic
Development Division
United States General Accounting Office

Dear Mr. Woods:

We agree in general with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the draft of your Report to the Congress on Progress and Problems in Achieving Objectives of the School Lunch Program. We find them to be consistent with our own experience and findings in the administration of the program.

It is felt that our comments as included in the draft report accurately reflect our position at the time of the working-review meeting with your representatives and we wish to furnish the following comments concerning subsequent program developments.

With regard to the "no-program" schools we believe that a distinction must be made between schools which offer no food service at all and those which provide a food service, but do not participate in the Federal program. FNS is specifically committed to reaching both categories of "no-program" schools in its outreach efforts with primary efforts toward the former category. We are committed to an annual update of inventory data on no-program schools and are currently tabulating the results of the October 1972 survey from which final data will be available shortly.

A three-way simultaneous nationwide drive, involving a concentrated joint effort by Regional, State and Washington FNS personnel, to reach no-program schools was launched in August 1972. Formal outreach action plans have been adopted in each of the five regions and FNS and State personnel are conducting meetings and workshops and initiating mass mailings to the nonparticipating school officials, in line with our commitment to bring 5,000 additional schools into the program in 1972-73 and to reach as many as possible within three years. Concentrated outreach efforts are being emphasized in eleven selected States where numbers of schools and children without food service in public and private schools are particularly high, and top priority has been assigned to establishing programs in Title I schools. In some cases FNS regional personnel are assisting those State Agencies that do not have sufficient personnel by directly conducting the outreach effort within those States. The Regional Administrators forward a detailed monthly progress report to the Director of the Agency's Child Nutrition Division on the status of new programs established as well as the status of schools refusing to participate and reasons for the refusal.

In line with our comments on the lack of facilities and equipment, the agency has made available a brochure that illustrates various methods of providing an adequate school lunch to children enrolled in schools without in-house preparation and serving facilities. This brochure is being forwarded to appropriate nonparticipants as they are identified. Fiscal procedures have been instituted for the reservation and apportionment of 50 per centum of the appropriated nonfood assistance funds to assist needy schools without a food service as required by the recent amendment of Section 5 of the Child Nutrition Act. Also, agency personnel are deeply involved with developing the methodology and reporting forms for the survey among the States and school districts on unmet needs for equipment in schools eligible for assistance. The results of the survey, to be conducted this spring, will be reported to the Congress as required by Section 6(e) of Public Law 92-433.

Since the major changes in the free and reduced price meal requirements were enacted into law in May 1970 the daily service of free and reduced price lunches has been increased from 3.1 million in FY 1969 to 8.3 million in November 1972 through the agency's determined efforts with the cooperative, intensive actions of the State Agency and local school food authority personnel. The efforts have been somewhat hampered and at times delayed due to the timing of legislative amendments directly affecting the program and the promulgation of regulatory changes. The Secretary's income poverty guidelines applicable to the current school year were published in May, and guidance on the updating and implementation of the free and reduced price policies was issued in mid-June to permit all schools to have effective, approved policy statements at the beginning of the academic year. The Agency is continuing its determined efforts to direct general and specific corrective action on the program deficiencies disclosed in the OIG audit report, as well as those disclosed in our administrative on-site visits and reviews. We have also issued guidance on the policy changes required by enactment of Public Law 92-433. We have closely reviewed all of the State Agency policies, and as part of this year's administrative analyses, FNS personnel have reviewed the local school food authorities' policies as approved in the State Agency offices. Also, on-site visits have been made to selected school districts and to individual schools in all States for a first hand review of local administration of the policies, and to assure that they are implemented in line with the Department's regulations and Federal law.

APPENDIX III

Concerning the adequacy of per-meal lunch cost data, in addition to the policy statement currently being developed which will specifically define allowable reimbursement costs, the agency issued guidelines on June 8 to the Regional Administrators for determining the cost of producing a Type A lunch. The methods vary depending, in part, upon the type of accounting systems used in the schools. Many systems currently followed do not permit definitive determinations on the per-lunch cost of providing a Type A lunch. In addition, we anticipate that the new accounting handbook, which has undergone field testing, will achieve a uniform definition of costs--in both the accounting sense and for determining levels of Federal reimbursement.

With consideration of these additional comments we feel that your report realistically summarizes the current status of the program.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Hekman
Administrator

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE:		
Earl L. Butz	Dec. 1971	Present
Clifford M. Hardin	Jan. 1969	Nov. 1971
ASSISTANT SECRETARY, MARKETING AND CONSUMER SERVICES:		
Clayton Yeutter	Jan. 1973	Present
Richard E. Lyng	Mar. 1969	Jan. 1973
ADMINISTRATOR, FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE:		
Edward J. Hekman	Sept. 1969	Present

543/544

Copies of this report are available at a cost of $1 from the U.S. General Accounting Office, Room 6417, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548. Orders should be accompanied by a check or money order. Please do not send cash.

When ordering a GAO report please use the B-Number, Date and Title, if available, to expedite filling your order.

Copies of GAO reports are provided without charge to Members of Congress, congressional committee staff members, Government officials, news media, college libraries, faculty members and students.

ITEM 3—ARTICLES OF INTEREST

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 17, 1973]

PROXMIRE LASHES BUTZ FOR SCHOOL MILK CUTS

Associated Press

Senator William Proxmire has accused Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz of breaking the law by cutting back on the program providing low-cost milk to schoolchildren.

In the past, Proxmire said yesterday, the program has provided milk for about 4 cents per half-pint to children for consumption during a snack break. But Butz has limited the program to schools with no lunch program, the Wisconsin Democrat said.

"Not only does this decision to limit the program fly in the face of good nutritional practices," Proxmire said in a statement, "it is a blatant disregard of the law as written by the Congress in 1970."

At that time Congress ordered that the Agriculture Secretary administer the program "to the maximum extent practicable in the same manner as he administered the special milk program provided . . . during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969," Proxmire said.

Recently, however, the House concurred in the Nixon administration decision to cut funding for the milk program from $97 million to $25 million. The Senate has voted for the $97 million. A Senate-House conference committee is working on a compromise.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1973]

. . . BUT SOME HUNGER, TOO

Close to 1 million youngsters have returned to school to find that no free or low-cost lunches are any longer available to them. The cost of food has risen to a level that makes it impossible for many communities to pay the bill within their educational budget. At the same time, the Federal contribution to these subsidized meals has remained frozen at 8 cents a lunch, 5 cents a breakfast and 40 cents for lunches for the poorest children.

The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has found that school districts in at least 12 States have had to drop lunch programs. Thirty-seven States have raised the price students must pay or have reduced the quality and quantity of the meals.

Responding to a situation that threatens the health of so many children and poses a particularly serious threat to the well-being of those who cannot be adequately fed at home, the House has defied the administration and, by a vote of 389 to 4, approved a bill that would add aproximately $80 million to the regular school lunch subsidy, $70 million more for free and reduced-price lunches, and $16 million for breakfasts. This would raise the Federal contribution to these meals by somewhere between 2 and 5 cents a meal. A slightly more generous Senate proposal would add a total of $200 million. The existing Federal subsidy, fixed before the recent inflation in food prices, is about $1 billion.

These entirely realistic proposed increases face a presidential veto. Yet the need for adjusted subsidies is so compelling and the harm done by the elimination of school lunches or the reduction of their nutritional content so serious a threat to pupil welfare that speedy action by Congress is essential, overriding Mr. Nixon if necessary.

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1063

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 1, 1973

Mr. HUMPHREY introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

A BILL

To establish a program of nutrition education for children as a part of the national school lunch and child nutrition programs and to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for purposes related to strengthening the existing child nutrition programs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Child Nutrition Education Act of 1973".

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to formulate the basic elements of a nutrition education program for children to be extended on a voluntary basis through State educational agencies to schools and service institutions as a part of the school lunch and child nutrition programs. Such a program shall include, but shall not be limited to, the preparation of course outlines, based on the advice of experts in the field of child nutrition, classroom teaching aids, visual materials, the training of school food service personnel, and the training of teachers to conduct courses in nutrition utilizing the school food service program as a laboratory. In developing such a program the Secretary shall consult with the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with recognized authorities in the field of human nutrition and nutrition education.

(b) For the fiscal year 1974, the Secretary is authorized to use not to exceed $2,000,000 out of funds made available for the conduct of school lunch and child nutrition programs for the purpose of developing a nutrition education program as outlined under (a) above. From the funds made available under this subsection, the Secretary shall advance to each State educational agency an amount not to exceed $25,000 for the fiscal year 1974. The amounts so advanced shall be for the purpose of the employment of a nutrition education specialist in each State educational agency in order to provide for the planning and development of a nutrition education program for the children in each State.

(c) For the fiscal year 1975 grants to the States for the conduct of nutrition education programs for children shall be based on a rate of 50 cents for each child enrolled in schools or service institutions within the State and, for each fiscal year thereafter, grants will be based on a rate of $1 for each child so enrolled. Enrollment data so used will be the lastest available as certified by the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(d) The funds made available under subsection (c) may be used for the employment of personnel including supporting services, in the State educational agencies to coordinate and promote the conduct of nutrition education programs in participating school districts, and for other purposes related to such programs.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the funds necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

(e) A nutrition education advisory council shall be established in each State to provide guidance and assistance in formulating the nutrition education program to be conducted in the State under the authority of this section. The members of the council shall be appointed by the chief state school officer of each State, and approved by the State educational agency and shall be professionals in the fields of nutrition, education, health, and welfare.

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"For each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1974, State educational agencies are authorized to use an amount, not to exceed 2 per centum of aggregated payments made to such agencies by the Secretary under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 in the preceding fiscal year, to assist in the administration and supervision of the programs authorized under such Acts: *Provided*, That not less than 75 per centum of any funds used under this authority shall be directed to the employment of field nutrition supervisors and auditors who have a certificate of training in the subject areas or the equivalent in field supervisory or auditing experience: *Provided further*, That the funds expended under this section shall be used to supplement the existing level of administrative support services and expenditures therefor for the child nutrition programs in each State."

SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of section 4(e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows:

"Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to schools selected by the State educational agency to assist such schools in financing the costs of operating a breakfast program and for the purpose of subsection (d)."

(b) The second sentence of section 4(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is deleted.

(c) Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding the following paragraphs at the end of such section:

"The national average payment established by the Secretary for all breakfasts served to eligible children shall not be less than 8 cents; an amount of not less than 15 cents shall be added for each reduced-price breakfast; and an amount of not less than 20 cents shall be added for each free breakfast. In cases of severe need, a payment of up to 45 cents may be made for breakfasts served to children qualifying for a free breakfast.

"For the fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, the breakfast payments specified in this subsection shall reflect changes in the cost of operating a school breakfast program under this Act by giving equal weight to changes in the wholesale prices of all foods and hourly wage rates for employees of eating places published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 5. Section 14 of the National School Lunch Act is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) replace the word "thirteen" with the word "nineteen" and insert after the phrase "(or the equivalent thereof)", the first time it appears the following: "one member shall be a supervisor of a school lunch program in a school system in an urban area (or the equivalent thereof); one member shall be a supervisor of a school lunch program in a school system in a rural area; two members shall be parents of school age children; two members shall be secondary school students participating in the school lunch program,";

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out "nine" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen", and by adding the following to said subsection: "The new members to be appointed to the council as provided for by reason of the amendment to subsection (a) made by section 5 of the Child Nutrition Education Act of 1973, shall be appointed for terms of three years, except that the terms of the secondary students shall be two years."

(3) In subsection (e), delete the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten".

(4) Subsection (f) is amended by adding the following at the end of such subsection: "For the purpose of obtaining

information incident to making the aforesaid recommendations, the council, by vote of its members present may request the appearance, at any of its meetings, of representatives from governmental or nongovernmental agencies or organizations concerned with the nutrition and welfare of children."

(5) Such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(i) The Council shall continue in existence until terminated by Act of Congress enacted after the enactment of the Child Nutrition Education Act of 1973."

REGULATIONS

SEC. 6. The National School Lunch Act is amended by adding after section 15 the following new section:

"SEC. 16. Prior to the publication in the Federal Register of any proposed regulations to implement the provision of this Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, the Secretary shall solicit the comments and recommendations of the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition, and a representative group of State and local school food service administrators and selected lay citizens and shall establish a five-member group to work with the Department of Agriculture in the development of such regulations that reflect the comments of such groups."

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 7. (a) Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act is amended to delete the phrase "8 cents per lunch" as it appears in said section and substitute the phrase "10 cents per lunch". For the fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, the national average payment shall reflect changes in the cost of operating the school lunch program under this Act by giving equal weight to changes in the wholesale prices of all foods and hourly wage rates for employees of eating places published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(b) In any fiscal year in which the national average payment is increased above the amount prescribed in the previous fiscal year, the maximum Federal food-cost contribution rate, for the type of lunch served, as provided for under section 8 of the National School Lunch Act, shall be increased by a like amount.

SPECIAL FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

SEC. 8. Section 13 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following to subsection (d) of said section: ": *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may enter into agreement with State educational agencies for the administration of the program in situations where it is conducted under sponsorship of the local government. In such situations the Secretary shall reimburse participating service institutions through State educational agencies under agreement with the Secretary.".

COMPETITIVE FOODS

SEC. 9. (a) Section 9 (a) of the National School Lunch Act (nutritional and other program requirements) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Additional foods which make a significant nutritional contribution may be offered for sale to children during the periods of food service conducted under programs authorized under this Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to the extent such offerings are necessary to meet nutritional needs of pupils in participating schools: *Provided, however,* That the sale of such additional foods shall be under the management and control of the food service department of the school and proceeds from such sales shall accrue to said department."

(b) The second sentence of section 10 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1779) is deleted.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

SEC. 10. (a) Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (c), and by striking out subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Except as provided in section 10 of this Act, in each fiscal year each State educational agency shall receive special assistance payments in an amount to be determined in the following manner: multiplying the number of lunches (consisting of a combination of foods and meeting the minimum nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 9(a) of this Act) served free to children eligible for such lunches in schools within that State during such fiscal year by the special-assistance factor for free lunches prescribed by the Secretary for such fiscal year and multiplying the number of lunches served at a reduced price to children eligible for such reduced-price lunches in schools within that State during such fiscal year by the special-assistance factor for reduced-price lunches prescribed by the Secretary for such fiscal year. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, the Secretary shall prescribe a special-assistance factor for free lunches of not less than 45 cents and a special-assistance factor for reduced-price lunches which shall be 10 cents less than the special-assistance factor for free lunches. For fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, the special-assistance factor to be prescribed by the Secretary for free lunches shall reflect changes in the cost of operating a school lunch program under this Act by giving equal weight to changes in the wholesale prices of all foods and hourly wage rates for employees of eating places published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

"(b) Except as provided in section 10 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, the special-assistance payments made to each State agency during each fiscal year under the provisions of this section shall be used by such State agency to assist schools of that State in financing the cost of providing free and reduced price lunches served to children pursuant to subsection 9 (b) of this Act. The amount of such special assistance funds that a school shall from time to time receive, within a maximum per lunch amount established by the Secretary for all States, shall be based on the need of the school for such special assistance. Such maximum per lunch amount established by the Secretary shall not be less than 60 cents."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section (as so redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in the case of any school attendance unit in which 85 per centum or more of the students are eligible for free or reduced price meals, all students in such school attendance units shall be served meals free of charge. In such case, all meals served in such attendance unit shall be reimbursed at the special assistance factor for free lunches approved by the State educational agency."

COMMODITIES

SEC. 11. Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(d) In any fiscal year in which the Secretary is unable to expend the full amounts budgeted and programed for the purchase of commodities under section 6 of this Act and section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, the amounts unexpended shall be distributed among the States for the purchase of food by public and nonprofit private schools participating in the school lunch program. The determination of the amounts available for such distribution shall be made by February 1 of each fiscal year and the actual distribution shall be made as soon as practicable after that date, but in no event later than March 15. The distribution of funds to the States under this section shall be made on the basis of the formula used in allocating section 6 and section 32 commodities for the school lunch program among the States."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 12. Subsection 5(e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding the following sentence at the end of such subsection: "For the purposes of this subsection the term 'schools without a food service' shall include those schools which have initiated food service on a temporary and emergency basis and desire to establish an improved and more effective food service on a permanent basis to better meet the needs of children in attendance."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NONFOOD ASSISTANCE

SEC. 13. The first sentence of section 5 (a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by deleting the figure "$20,000,000" and substituting the figure "$40,000,000".

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM TO ALL SCHOOLS

SEC. 14. Section 8 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by adding the following before the period at the end of said section: ": *Provided*, That a school food authority that operates a school lunch program under this Act in one or more of the public schools under its jurisdiction shall operate the program in all schools under its jurisdiction by no later than the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. It is further provided that the national school lunch program is to be extended, by September 1, 1975, to all public schools in which children are in attendance who qualify for free or reduced price lunches under the standards established by this Act."

INCLUSION OF TRUST TERRITORY

SEC. 15. Subsection (d) of section 12 of the National School Lunch Act, as amended, is amended by inserting the phrase "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," before the word "or" in paragraph (1); by deleting paragraphs

(4), (5), and (6); and by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (4).

GRANTS FOR PROGRAM COSTS

SEC. 16. The National School Lunch Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"LOCAL COSTS OF SUPERVISION

"SEC. 17. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to State educational agencies, out of amounts appropriated by Congress for the purposes of this section, to assist in the supervision of local program operations. The grant to each State is to be determined on the basis of $250 for each school attendance unit participating in programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966."

Calendar No. 380

93d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 9639

[Report No. 93–404]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

September 17, 1973

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

September 21, 1973

Reported by Mr. Allen, with amendments

AN ACT

To amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for the purpose of providing additional Federal financial assistance to the school lunch and school breakfast programs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act Amendments of 1973".

REIMBURSEMENT

Sec. 2. (a) Section 4 of the National School Lunch Act is amended to delete the phrase "8 cents per lunch" as it appears in said section and substitute the phrase "10 cents per lunch".

(b) Section 8 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: "In any fiscal year in which the national average payment per lunch determined under section 4 is increased above the amount prescribed in the previous fiscal year, the maximum Federal food-cost contribution rate, for the type of lunch served, shall be increased by a like amount."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively, and by striking out subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Except as provided in section 10 of this Act, in each fiscal year each State educational agency shall receive special-assistance payments in an amount equal to the sum of the product obtained by multiplying the number of lunches (consisting of a combination of foods which meet the minimum nutritional requirements prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 9 (a) of this Act) served free to children eligible for such lunches in schools within that State during such fiscal year by the special-assistance factor for free lunches prescribed by the Secretary for such fiscal year and the product obtained by multiplying the number of lunches served at a reduced price to children eligible for such reduced-price lunches in schools within that State during such fiscal year by the special-assistance factor for reduced-price lunches prescribed by the Secretary for such fiscal year. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, the Secretary shall prescribe a special-assistance factor for free lunches of not less than 45 cents and a special-assistance factor for reduced-price lunches which shall be 10 cents less than the special-assistance factor for free lunches.

"(b) Except as provided in section 10 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, the special-assistance payments made to each State agency during each fiscal year under the provisions of this section shall be used by such State agency to assist schools of that State in financing the cost of providing free and reduced-price lunches served to children pursuant to subsection 9 (b) of this Act. The amount of such special assistance funds that a school shall from time to time receive, within a maximum per lunch amount established by the Secretary for all States, shall be based on the need of the school for such special assistance. Such maximum per lunch amount established by the Secretary shall not be less than 60 cents.

"(c) Special assistance payments to any State under this section shall be made as provided in the last sentence of section 7 of this Act."

(b) The proviso of section 10 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by inserting "and section 11" after "section 4".

SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of section 4(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows: "Funds apportioned and paid to any State for the purpose of this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency to schools selected by the State educational agency to assist such schools in financing the costs of operating a breakfast program and for the purpose of subsection (d)."

(b) The second sentence of section 4(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is deleted.

(c) Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding the following sentences at the end of such section: "The national average payment established by the Secretary for all breakfasts served to eligible children shall not be less than 8 cents; an amount of not less than 15 cents shall be added for each reduced-price breakfast; and an amount of not less than 20 cents shall be added for each free breakfast. In cases of severe need, a payment of up to 45 cents may be made for each breakfast served to children qualifying for a free breakfast."

CASH IN LIEU OF COMMODITIES

SEC. 5. (a) Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act is amended by striking the present subsections (b), (c), and (d) and by substituting in lieu thereof the following new subsections;

"(b) As of February 15 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make an estimate of the value of agricultural commodities and other foods that will be delivered during that fiscal year to States for school food service programs under the provisions of this section, section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935. If such estimated value is less than 90 per centum of the value of such deliveries initially programmed for that fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay to State educational agencies, by not later than March 15 of that fiscal year, an amount of funds that is equal to the difference between the value of such deliveries initially programed for such fiscal year and the estimated value as of February 15 of such fiscal year of the commodities and other foods to be delivered in such fiscal year. The share of such funds to be paid to each State educational agency shall bear the same ratio to the total of such payment to all such agencies as the number of meals served under the provisions of section 9 (a) of this Act and section 4 (e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 during the preceding fiscal year bears to the total of all such meals served in all the States during such fiscal year: *Provided*, That in any State in which the Secretary directly administers school food service programs in the nonprofit private schools of such State, the Secretary shall withhold from the funds to be paid to any such State under the provisions of this subsection an amount that bears the same ratio to the total of such payment as the number of meals served in nonprofit private schools under the provisions of section 9 (a) of this Act and section 4 (e) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 during that fiscal year bears to the total of such meals served in all the schools in such State in such fiscal year. Each State educational agency, and the Secretary in the case of nonprofit private schools in which he directly administers school food service programs, shall promptly and equitably disburse such funds to schools participating in the lunch and breakfast programs under this Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and such disbursements shall be used by such schools to obtain agricultural commodities and other foods for their food service program. Such food shall be limited to the requirements for lunches and breakfasts for children as provided for in the regulations by the Department of Agriculture under title 7, subtitle (b), chapter II, subchapter (a), parts 210 and 220.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, until such time as a supplemental appropriation may provide additional funds for the purpose of subsection (b) of this section, shall use funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) to make any payments to States authorized under such subsection. Any section 32 funds utilized to make such payments shall be reimbursed out of any supplemental appropriation hereafter enacted for the purpose of carrying out subsection (b) of this section and such reimbursement shall be deposited into the fund established pursuant to section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, to be available for the purposes of said section 32.

"(d) Any funds made available under subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall not be subject to the State matching provisions of section 7 of this Act."

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM EXTENSION

SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 17(a) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by striking out "and June 30, 1974," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975,"*; and by inserting after the word "State" each place it occurs the following: "; Indian tribe, band, or group recognized by the Department of the Interior; or the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare".* The second sentence of such section 17(a) is amended by striking out "two-year" and inserting in lieu thereof "three-year".

(b) ~~The second sentence of section 17(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "In order to carry out such program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and~~

~~during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, there is authorized to be appropriated for each such fiscal year the sum of $20,000,000, but in the event that such sum has not been appropriated for such purpose by August 1, 1973, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and by August 1, 1974, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, the Secretary shall use $20,000,000, or, if any amount has been appropriated for such program for the fiscal year concerned, the difference, if any, between the amount directly appropriated for such purpose and $20,000,000, out of funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612(c))."~~ *Section 17(b) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence thereof the following: "In order to carry out such program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000,000, but in the event that such sum has not been appropriated for such purpose by August 1, 1974, the Secretary shall use $40,000,000, or, if any amount has been appropriated for such program, the difference, if any, between the amount directly appropriated for such purpose and $40,000,000, out of funds appropriated by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612(c))."*

(c) The second sentence of section 17(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1973" and "March 30, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1974" and "March 30, 1975", respectively.

ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

SEC. 7. Section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any school or nonprofit child care institution shall receive the special milk program upon their request. Children that qualify for free lunches under guidelines set forth by the Secretary shall also be eligible for free milk."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 8. Section 14 of the National School Lunch Act is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) strike the word "thirteen" and insert the word "fifteen" and insert after the phrase "(or the equivalent thereof)," the first time it appears the following: "one member shall be a supervisor of a school lunch program in a school system in an urban area (or the equivalent thereof), one member shall be a supervisor of a school lunch program in a school system in a rural area,".

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) is amended by striking out "nine" and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven", and by striking "such" and inserting "the nine".

(3) In subsection (e), strike the word "Seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Eight".

Passed the House of Representatives September 13, 1973.

Attest: W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

○